INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Huehnergard, John

THE AKKADIAN DIALECTS OF CARCHEMISH AND UGARIT

Harvard University   PH.D.   1979

University
Microfilms
International   300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE
(To be placed in Original Copy)

The undersigned, appointed by the

~~Division~~

Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations

~~Committee~~

have examined a thesis entitled

 The Akkadian Dialects of Carchemish and Ugarit

presented by   John Huehnergard

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and hereby
certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature ....*Thomas O. Lambdin*............

Typed name ....Thomas O. Lambdin............

Signature ....*William L. Moran*........

Typed name ....William L. Moran............

Signature ....

Typed name ....

Date September 14, 1979

The Akkadian Dialects of

Carchemish and Ugarit

A thesis presented

by

John Huehnergard

to

The Department of

Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

September, 1979

to my parents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Professor William L. Moran, my teacher in Assyriology, and my advisor in this study, for his thorough instruction and unfailing encouragement, both before and during the time the study was in progress.

I wish, too, to thank Professor Thomas O. Lambdin, for his systematic instruction in comparative Semitic philology.

The advice and guidance of these two extraordinary scholars and teachers has always been given abundantly and unselfishly, and will be evident throughout the dissertation.

NOTE: Two important works appeared too late to be used for this study: Claude F.M. Schaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica VII* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1978); and Thomas John Finley, "Word Order in the Clause Structure of Syrian Akkadian" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1979).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

A	adverb; adverbial (or prepositional) phrase
acc.	accusative
Adler, *AKTM*	Hans-Peter Adler, *Das Akkadische des Königs Tušratta von Mitanni*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung* (Berlin: Graz)
AHw	Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*
Akk.	Akkadian
AkkAl	see Giacumakis, *AkkAl*
AkkBo	see Labat, *AkkBo*
AKTM	see Adler, *AKTM*
ALM	see Finet, *ALM*
*AnOr*48	Loren R. Fisher, *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia 48*
Ap	sentence- or clause-initial adverb or adverbial phrase
Aro, *Glossar*	Jussi Aro, *Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen*
Aro, *Infinitivkonstrukition*	Jussi Aro, *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen*
Aro, *SMbG*	Jussi Aro, *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik*
ArOr	*Archiv Orientální, Journal of the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute, Prague* (Prague)
AS³	Wolfram von Soden and Wolfgang Röllig, *Das akkadische Syllabar*, 3rd ed.
Ass.	Assyrian
AT	D.J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*
Bab.	Babylonian

BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (Baltimore)
BiOr	*Bibliotheca Orientalis* (Leiden)
"BoAkk"	see Durham, "BoAkk"
Böhl, *Sprache*	F.M.Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*
Bush, "Hurrian"	Frederic W. Bush, "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language"
"Byblos"	see Moran, "Byblos"
C	consonant
CAD	A. Leo Oppenheim et al., eds., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*
Conj.	conjunction
dat.	dative
DN, *DN*	divine name
dur.	durative (form)
Durham, "BoAkk"	John W. Durham, "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian"
EA	J.A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*
Ec.	economic text
ex(x).	example(s)
f, f.	feminine
Finet, *ALM*	André Finet, *L'accadien des lettres de Mari*
FN, *FN*	feminine name
GAG	Wolfram von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik samt Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*
GAL	Wright, *GAL*
gen.	genitive
GHB	see Joüon, *GHB*

Giacumakis, *AkkAl* George Giacumakis, Jr., *The Akkadian of Alalaḫ*

GKT   see Hecker, *GKT*

Glossar   see Aro, *Glossar*

GN, *GN*   geographical name

Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln see Salonen

Hecker, *GKT*   Karl Hecker, *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*

"Hurrian"   see Bush, "Hurrian"

Hurro-Akkadisch see Wilhelm

imper.   imperative

infin.   infinitive

Infinitivkonstruktionen see Aro

J   legal (juridical) text(s)

JAOS   *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (New Haven)

JCS   *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* (Cambridge, Massachusetts)

JNES   *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (Chicago)

Joüon, *GHB*   Paul Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*

JSS   *Journal of Semitic Studies* (Manchester)

K   Carchemish; text or the corpus of texts written at Carchemish

L   letter(s)

Labat, *AkkBo* René Labat, *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*

LB   Late Babylonian

lit.   literally

m, m.   masculine

MA   Middle Assyrian

Mayer, *UGMa*   Walter Mayer, *Untersuchungen zum Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*

MB   Middle Babylonian

MÉA[5]   René Labat and Florence Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*, 5th ed.

mng.   meaning

Moran, "Byblos"   William L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets"

Moran, "Syrian Scribe"   William L. Moran, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity*

MRS   *Mission de Ras Shamra*

n.   note

NA   Neo-Assyrian

NB   Neo-Babylonian

no.   number

nom.   nominative

O   direct object

OA   Old Assyrian

OAkk   Old Akkadian

OB   Old Babylonian

obv.   obverse

OrNS   *Orientalia Nova Series* (Roma)

p   plural

p.   passim

p(p).   page(s)

"Parataxis"   see Patterson, "Parataxis"

Patterson, "Parataxis"   Richard D. Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis..."

perf.	perfect
pl.	plural
PN,	masculine personal name
prec.	precative
pret.	preterite
PRU	Jean Nougayrol, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit (III, IV, VI)*
q.v.	which see
r	reverse
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* (Paris)
RÉS	*Revue des études sémitiques* (Paris)
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali* (Roma)
s	singular
S	subject
Salonen, *Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*	Erkki Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*
SB	Standard Babylonian
sg.	singular
SMbG	see Aro, *SMbG*
Sprache	see Böhl *Sprache*
subjn.	subjunctive
s.v.	under the word in question
Swaim, "UgAkk"	Gerald G. Swaim, "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets found at Ugarit"
Sy	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie* (Paris)
"Syrian Scribe"	see Moran, "Syrian Scribe"

T	treaty text(s)
U	Ugarit; text or the corpus of texts written at Ugarit
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn)
Ug. 5	Jean Nougayrol et al., *Ugaritica V*
"UgAkk"	see Swaim, "UgAkk"
UGMa	see Mayer, *UGMa*
UT	Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*
v,V	vowel
V, V(o)	verb, verb with pronominal acc. suffix
voc.	vocative
vs.	versus
Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*	Gernot Wilhelm, *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*
WPA	western peripheral Akkadian
Wright, *GAL*	W. Wright, *Grammar of the Arabic Language*
WS	West-Semitic
x	illegible sign
1,2,3	persons of the verb or pronominal system
*	a text whose place of origin is not absolutely certain
**	indicates less certainty than *
*	indicates the following form is reconstructed or not attested
!	scribal error
[ ]	text broken
< >	scribal omission
<< >>	scribal plus
:	transliterates a "Glossenkeil" (⪦) in the text

INTRODUCTION

The present work is a descriptive grammar of two groups of texts, one composed by scribes at the ancient city-state of Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra), the other originating in ancient Carchemish (modern Jerablus). All but five of the texts that will be considered were unearthed at Ras Shamra during the excavations, since 1929, of the French *Mission de Ras Shamra* (*MRS*), under the direction of Claude F.A. Schaeffer. Nearly all of the Akkadian documents that have been published to date were copied, transliterated, and translated by Jean Nougayrol, in four publications of the *MRS*.[1] The remaining texts are a small number that appeared prior to these volumes, and that were not republished in them,[2] and four texts taken illegally

_____

[1]All under the general editorship of Claude F.A. Schaeffer; in particular: *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit, III* (= MRS VI): *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales,* 1955; *IV* (=MRS IX): *Textes accadiens des archives sud,* 1956; *VI* (=MRS XII): *Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du grand palais et du palais sud d'Ugarit,* 1970; *Ugaritica V* (=MRS XVI): *Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit...,* 1968. All published in Paris at the Imprimerie Nationale. Hereafter: (*PRU*) 3,4,6, (*Ug.*) 5, respectively.

[2]These may be found in the following: E. Dhorme, "Petite tablette accadienne de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 16 (1935) 194f. (6.345); idem, "Lettre du roi de Kargamish au roi d'Ugarit," in *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud* (Paris: Paul Guenther, 1939), 203ff. (8.333, republished, in transliteration only, in *PRU* 3:7f.); F.

from Ras Shamra that were later recovered, and issued in a separate publication.[3]

The five texts not found at Ras Shamra are royal letters to the Egyptian court, all certainly or probably from Ugarit. They are part of the great archive of international correspondence found at El-Amarna (ancient Akhet-Aton), and appear as numbers 45 to 49 in J.A. Knudtzon's edition of the letters.[4]

The Akkadian tablets found at Ras Shamra that have so far been published number over seven hundred. Those written at Ugarit itself consist of (a) copies of letters from the royal court to the courts of other states, and to local officials, and letters of local officials to the king of Ugarit and to fellow administrators; (b) a great number of texts which document several different kinds of legal

---

Thureau-Dangin, "Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d'apres une tablette de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 15 (1934), 137ff. (Latakia); idem, "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 18 (1937), 237ff. (8.145; 8.208; 8.213; note: 8.208:1-12 was republished, in transliteration only, in *PRU* 3:110f.); Ch. Virolleaud, "Cinq tablettes accadiennes de Ras-Shamra," *RA* 38 (1941), 1ff. (10.046=*PRU* 3:9f.; 11.856; 11.839=*PRU* 3:194f.; 11.787=*PRU* 3:194a; 8.043); idem, "Six textes de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 28 (1951), 163ff. (14.16).

[3]Loren R. Fisher, ed., *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia* 48 (Roma: Pontificium Biblicum Institutum, 1971). The tablets were probably taken from Ras Shamra sometime in 1957; they were acquired by Fisher for the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in 1970. Text 1957.1 was treated by Fisher (pp. 11ff.), 1957.2-4 by M.C. Astour (pp. 23ff.). Hereafter: *AnOr* 48.

[4]*Die El-Amarna Tafeln* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915; reprinted, Aalen: Otto Zeller, 1964). Hereafter: *EA*.

cases;[5] (c) many economic dockets (lists of personnel, rations, tools, and so on); (d) copies of religious and literary texts; and (e) texts pertaining to the scribal art (syllabaries and vocabularies).

The Ras Shamra texts that were written elsewhere, that is, the international archives, consist of (a) letters from the royal courts of Khatti, Carchemish, Amurru, and Siyannu/Ushnatu, as well as one or two each from several other states,[6] and a small number of letters from ambassadors of the Ugarit court who were posted in some of those states; (b) treaties between Ugarit and its neighbors Amurru and Siyannu, or imposed by its overlords Khatti and Carchemish; and (c) legal documents involving parties of more than one state, also promulgated by Ugarit's overlords or neighbors.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

Although the content of these tablets has received considerable attention, the grammar has not. Nougayrol's presentation of the texts is consistently excellent; few of his interpretations, and even fewer of his readings, fail to be correct under close scrutiny. But apart from a small number of notes, the purpose of which was to jus-

---

[5]The largest group are the royal grants of real estate; there are also texts concerning private grants, sales, purchases, exchanges, liberations of slaves, adoptions, guarantees, and the like. An analysis of the content of these documents was presented by G. Boyer, in *PRU* 3, 281ff.

[6]Alashiya (Cyprus), Amqu, Assyria, Beirut, Mukish, Parga, Qadesh, and Sidon.

tify particular readings or translations, and many of which are quite general, he devoted only a few pages to a brief summary of the grammar of the texts.[7] The projected volume describing the grammar unfortunately never appeared.[8] Articles by other scholars which have dealt wholly or in part with the grammar of the tablets have normally been in the form of reviews of the *MRS* publications,[9] and a review is obviously an inconvenient format at best for such matters, and not conducive to detailed investigation.

However, there is an earlier dissertation treating the grammar of the texts found at Ras Shamra,[10] and so the question must be asked: is there a need for a fresh study? Several points argue for an affirmative answer. The most obvious is that Swaim's study was completed before *Ug.* 5 and *PRU* 6 appeared, increasing considerably the number of texts available. That fact alone would merit at least an appendix to the earlier work.

Secondly, Swaim and all other scholars who have discussed this material have taken a synoptic approach,

---

[7]*PRU* 3, xxxvf.

[8]Cf. *PRU* 3, xxxvi, n. 2.

[9]E.g., J. Aro, *AfO* 18 (1957-58), 143f.; C.H. Gordon, *RA* 50 (1956), 127ff.; L. Matous, *ArOr* 24 (1956), 375ff.; A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3 (1973), 34ff.; idem, *IOS* 5 (1975), 18ff.; E.A. Speiser, *JAOS* 75 (1955), 154ff.

[10]Gerald G. Swaim, "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit" (Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962); University Microfilms number 63-5831.

grouping all the texts together, regardless of their place
of origin or their genre, and presenting their grammar as
though it were a unified system. But in fact, as this
study will show, there are differences, some them major,
between the texts from different locales. In this work,
only the texts from Ugarit (U) and Carchemish (K) are con-
sidered, but the observation applies to the tablets from
other regions as well. There are often differences between
letters and legal texts besides. And, in the largest group
of texts studied here, the legal documents written at Uga-
rit, a few differences can even be discerned between texts
of different date. A study which groups all the texts to-
gether, therefore, cannot be more than a compendium of at-
tested forms, usages, and styles. Few scholars today would
present an undifferentiated grammar of the Amarna tablets,[11]
for it would avail little, for example, to cite an imper-
fective *iparras* from a letter of Burnaburiash of Babylon
alongside a *yaprusu* from a letter of Rib-Addi of Byblos.
Rather, the most profitable recent studies of that corpus
have dealt with texts from individual areas, or at least
taken their disparate origin into account.[12] While the

---

[11]Seventy years ago, F.M.Th. Böhl did publish such a
monograph, the value of which is limited not merely because
of its age, but also because of its presentation: *Die
Sprache der Amarna Briefe* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1909).

[12]E.g., W.L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dia-
lect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets" (PhD.
Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1950) - hereafter

differences in the texts found at Ras Shamra may not always be as great or as obvious, they nevertheless require the same approach.

Another consideration, in some ways related to the last, concerns the presentation of the material itself. Several grammars of Akkadian dialects, especially of peripheral Akkadian (including the previous study of the Ras Shamra texts), are essentially lists of forms found in a given corpus. But it is possible, and, I believe, important, to go beyond that, to attempt to describe fully the dialect, whether a living spoken one, or strictly a written one,[13] of the individuals who composed the documents now at our disposal. This involves, then, presenting not merely the forms, but also the ways in which they were used, the conditions and limits on their occurrence. It also involves

---

"Byblos"; idem, "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29, 1ff.; idem, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1975), 146ff. - hereafter: "Syrian Scribe"; C. Kühne, *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna, AOAT* 17 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973). A.F. Rainey, "Reflections on the Suffix Conjugations in West Semitized Amarna Tablets," *UF* 5, 235ff.; idem, "Morphology and the Prefix-Tenses of West Semitized El-*C*Amarna Tablets," *UF* 7, 395ff.

[13]The question, whether the Akkadian dialects of Ugarit and Carchemish were simply written systems employed by native scribes, or, in fact, real languages spoken by at least a part of the upper class (namely, the royal court, the nobility, and, of course, the scribes), can only be considered in conjunction with all texts from areas where Akkadian was not the native language. The topic is a large and complex one, and beyond the scope of this dissertation.

an investigation of the syntax of each dialect, for there
are dialectal peculiarities in that category as well as in
the phonology and morphology; An examination of the syntax
is conspicuously lacking, or only rudimentary, in many
Akkadian dialect studies. Finally, a study of a group of
peripheral Akkadian tablets should describe not only the
similarities to, and deviations from, native Akkadian, but
also attempt to describe the origin and development of
those deviations, and, where possible, draw any relevant
conclusions concerning the substrate dialect influences at
work.[14] I hope to have made in the present work at least
a beginning in these directions for the dialects of Akka-
dian at Ugarit and at Carchemish.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

The present study, undertaken at the suggestion of
Professor W.L. Moran, was originally to have encompassed
all the texts found at Ugarit. It soon became obvious,
however, that the number of texts, and the number of lo-
cales from which they originated, rendered such a scope
impractical. It was decided, therefore, to work only with
texts from the best represented areas. But, although texts
from the royal Hittite court are actually more numerous
than those from Carchemish, the former have been excluded,

----

[14]Cf., e.g., G. Wilhelm, *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-
Akkadischen von Nuzi, AOAT* 9 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukir-
chener Verlag, 1970), and the studies of Moran and Rainey
cited in n. 12, above.

for two reasons. First, many of the Khatti texts are badly damaged, to the extent that little of value could be said about their syntax. Secondly, and more importantly, according to the principles outlined above, the grammar of the texts found at Ras Shamra which originated in Khatti should be examined in conjunction with all other texts known to have been written there at approximately the same time. This, too, it was deemed, was an unmanageable corpus for a study of this size.

Therefore, the present work is not a grammar of the texts discovered at Ugarit, but rather two studies: one of the dialect of Akkadian written at Ugarit, the other of the dialect of Akkadian written at Carchemish. In a final summary, the major differences between the two, and the major similarities betweem them in areas in which they differ from native Akkadian, are considered. The corpus for the study of each dialect consists of all texts known to have been composed, or very probably composed, at each site. Thus, the five Amarna tablets that are certainly or probably from Ugarit are included in that corpus; no Carchemish texts other than those found at Ugarit are known.

Since it is almost certain that all the literary and religious texts found at Ras Shamra were copied from Mesopotamian originals, they have been excluded from the corpus; their grammar would not be normative for Ugarit Akkadian.

Some of the scribal texts may have been composed at Ugarit. Although they contain information for the lexicon, and, not infrequently, about the phonology, they will often represent learned scribal tradition, not normative Ugarit Akkadian grammar. Therefore, it was deemed preferable to omit them, for the present, from consideration in the following study.

For determining which of the texts were written at Ugarit or at Carchemish, a list compiled by C. Kühne,[15] of all published syllabic cuneiform texts found at Ras Shamra, was a great aid. The list was consulted for each text, although not followed in every case. Texts that were obviously written in either of these city-states are those that mention that the king, queen, or crown prince has sent them, or, in the case of most legal documents, that say the case was tried in the presence of (*ana panī*) the king. In other instances, the presence of a royal seal was assumed to be indicative of origin. There remain, of course, a number of broken texts where the name of the sender or promulgator and the seal are missing. Some of these could be included in the corpora on the basis of content alone. In other cases, the sender of a letter is an official, *probably* at Ugarit or Carchemish. Such texts are included in the study only if there is little doubt as to their origin. Nevertheless, some uncertainty must remain, and all such texts have been marked in this work with *. (Texts whose

---

[15]"Eine analytische Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 6, 129ff., with "Nachträge und Berichtigungen..." *UF* 7, 515f.

origin in either Ugarit or Carchemish is possible, but not
as probable, are marked with **, and normally cited only in
the notes, where appropriate.) Reasons for the inclusion
or exclusion of particular texts are given below in the
first section of each part.

<center>*   *   *</center>

As was mentioned above, Nougayrol's treatment of the
texts is superb. Only in a few instances have new inter-
pretations or readings been suggested, and these are al-
most invariably due to reconsiderations of the grammar in
the relevant passages. Normally, when the readings fol-
lowed here differ from Nougayrol's, the fact is pointed
out in a note.

Personal, divine, and geographical names have not
been considered in this study.[16] Quite often, such forms
are not affected by the grammar of their clauses. When
they are, they generally present no new information.
Therefore, all names have been indicated simply by the
designations PN, FN (for women), DN, or GN.

The orthography of all the texts found at Ugarit is
essentially the same as that of other WPA text groups;[17]

_____

[16]On personal names, see Frauke Gröndahl, *Die Personen-
namen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum
Biblicum, 1967); cf. also M. Liverani, "Antecedenti del
diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit," *RSO* 39,
131ff.

[17]Cf. Moshé Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*
(Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University

that is, there is much confusion of signs for voiced, voiceless, and emphatic consonants, interchange of signs CI and CE, and so on. In general, the orthography does not vary significantly from one center to another in the Ras Shamra tablets, and very few local peculiarities occur. Thus, it is not necessary to discuss it in detail for each individual dialect. Further, the discussion of the orthography presented in Swaim's dissertation[18] has not become outdated by the subsequent publication of new texts. Since it is pointless to repeat this evidence, there is no systematic presentation of it in the present work. Rather, only a few notes on the few peculiarities attested, and some new data, will be given.

The phonology is presented as a series of observations on matters relevant to determining the relationship of each dialect to native Babylonian or Assyrian, and to each other. Features of phonology that are common to all dialects of Akkadian, such as certain consonantal changes (for instance, *$i\underline{s}tabat{\rightarrow}i\underline{s}\underline{s}abat$), or syncopation of short unaccented vowels, (for example, *$paris\bar{u}{\rightarrow}pars\bar{u}$) are not normally discussed.

---

of Pennsylvania, 1937); John W. Durham, "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976) – hereafter: "BoAkk"; Th.V. Gamkrelidze, "The Akkado-Hittite Syllabary and the Problem of the Origin of the Hittite Script," *ArOr* 29, 406ff.; Guy Jucquois, *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest* (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1966); René Labat *L'akkadien de Boghaz-köi* (Bordeaux: Librairie Delmas, 1932) – hereafter: *AkkBo*; Moran, "Syrian Scribe".

[18]Op. cit. (above, n. 10), chapter 1.

"Morphology" in the following sections is in general
to be understood in a rather literal sense, namely, exami-
nation of the forms attested, their construction and fre-
quency, and their relationships and peculiarities vis-à-vis
normal and other peripheral Akkadian. For the sections on
"syntax" have been reserved nearly all analysis of the
function and interaction of words within clauses, and of
clauses within sentences.

The treatment of the stative in this work follows the
traditional interpretation, of most grammarians of Akkadian,
that it is part of the verbal system. This is not to imply,
however, that I am in disagreement with the excellent study
of G. Buccellati,[19] who suggests that the stative should be
considered part of the nominal system, that is, the pre-
dicative state of the verbal adjective, so that, for exam-
ple, *paris/parsāku* "he is/I am decided" is morphologically
and syntactically equivalent to *šar/šarrāku* "he is/I am
king," namely a predicative nominal form (adjective in the
case of *paris*, noun in the case of *šar*) plus an enclitic
nominative pronoun (for example, 3ms -∅; 1s -āku).[20] Buc-

---

[19] "An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a
Nominal Sentence," *JNES* 27, 1ff.

[20] Cf. ibid., 5f. Buccellati examines the conditions
in which the predicative state is found, and summarizes on
p. 10: "the nominal predicate of the nominal sentence oc-
curs regularly in the predicative state (= stative), except
when the predicate is immediately followed by a qualifica-
tion or complement, or by the particle -*ma*, in which case
the normal or construct states are used."

cellati's evidence and arguments are in fact very convincing, and his conclusions should be accepted for normal Akkadian grammar. But those conclusions affect more than the morphology; they have an important impact on our understanding of Akkadian syntax, namely—and this is Buccellati's main point—that clauses containing the stative are in fact nominal (or non-verbal) clauses. It is with this corollary that problems arise in our two corpora, especially in the Ugarit texts. For example, in nominal clauses in U, in which the predicate is a noun in the normal (unbound) or the bound form, it usually follows the subject (see below, 296f.). But when the predicate is a stative, it often precedes the subject, just as true verb forms often do (see below, 295f.). Further, although attributive adjectives always agree with their nouns in number, the predicative verbal adjectives (that is, statives), again, like true verbs, occasionally do not (see below, p.312). In more general terms, it may be said that the U scribes treated the stative as another verb form, in part perhaps because it resembled their own WS *qatala.[21]

Another problem is the unlikelihood that the U scribes made use of the predicative state for nouns (*šar, šarrāku*).

---

[21]It must be pointed out, however, that *semantically* the stative is treated no differently than in normal Akkadian, that is, it is rarely active (except in such cases where it is active in normal Akkadian, e.g. *našû*, etc.), as is often the case in certain Canaanizing Amarna dialects: e.g., *šaprāta* "you wrote" *EA252:5* (letter of Labayu).

If they did not, the noun and the stative were also treated
differently morphologically. Unfortunately, no clear in-
stances, in which a noun in the predicate state would be
used in normal Akkadian, occur in U or in K with the noun
written syllabically, to allow us to see its shape. A pos-
sible example in U is: *ša[ni̓ta]* SUM.MEŠ-*nu*[22] "Secondly,
it is a gift" 3:102:3; for *nidnu*, normal Akkadian would
presumably have *nidin*. But Buccellati himself presents
several examples, from other WPA texts, of the form *šarrum*
šū for "he is king" instead of expected *(šū) šar*.[23] It is
reasonable to expect that the U scribes too would have been
unfamiliar with the predicative state for nouns. Thus, the
stative would not have been a nominal form in their concept
of the grammar. Therefore, it seemed the more logical al-
ternative to to present the stative in U as part of the
verbal system. In the section on word order, however, the
stative is treated separately, to show the evidence more
clearly.

The situation in K, the grammar of which, as this
study will show, is most often very close to MB, is not
clear. The arguments concerning word order and agreement

---

[22]The form is probably sg., since the pl. of *nidnu* is
normally *nidnūtu* (occasionally *nidnātu*) in U: e.g., SUM.
MEŠ-*ti an-nu-ti* 3:145:31; cf. *l.*27. The MEŠ sign often
appears without indicating plurality; see below, 172ff.

[23]Op. cit., (see above, n. 19), 9, and nn. 33-37.
Buccellati notes, p. 7, that the construction *šarrum šū*
"is not regular Akkadian."

given above with respect to the U texts do not apply in K. No forms such as *nidnu or nidin* are found--no appropriate situations occur. Therefore, it is impossible to know whether a K scribe would have written **anāku tupšarru* or **tupšarrāku*. But, for convenience of reference, and symmetry of presentation, the stative in K has been dealt with as in U, that is, in the traditional fashion; again, however, it is considered separately in the section on word order.

<p style="text-align: center;">*   *   *</p>

For each of the grammatical features considered in the following sections, the data were gathered and examined separately for each of the text types in the corpus. If differences between any of the genres are apparent for a given feature, the genres are presented separately for that feature, and compared. But if no significant differences are found, the evidence of all the text types is combined and presented as a whole. Generally, there are fewer differences in the morphology than in the syntax. Further, the legal texts and treaties with few exceptions exhibit the same grammar.

Texts found in the publications of the *MRS* are cited by three Arabic numbers: the first is the volume number, that is: (*PRU*) 3, 4, 6, (*Ug.*) 5; the second is the page number, with a letter (a, b, c) indicating which text on a page, if there are two or more with the same line numbers; the

third is the line number. The five Amarna tablets are

cited by text and line number as found in Knudtzon's edi-

tion,[24] with the prefix *EA*. The tablets in *The Claremont*

Ras Shamra Tablets[25] are cited by page and line number,

with the prefix *AnOr*48. Texts published only in periodicals

are cited by page and line number, with an abbreviation of

the name of the periodical as prefix. The excavation

numbers of the tablets are not used in this work, apart

from the list of texts in each corpus. For those numbers,

and the findspots of the individual tablets, the reader is

directed to Kühne's list, mentioned above.[26] As was noted,

an asterisk (*) indicates that the origin of the text in

the area of the dialect under consideration is very likely,

but not absolutely certain, while a double asterisk (**)

indicates less certainty.[27]

---

[24]See above, n. 4.

[25]See above, n. 3.

[26]See above, n. 15.

[27]Note: throughout this study, ḫ in transliterations
and normalizations of Akk. words will be represented by *h*,
for typographic simplicity. In transliterations of Ugaritic
words, however, *h*, *ḥ*, and *ḫ* are always distinguished.

THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF CARCHEMISH

A. THE CORPUS

The K corpus consists of 40 texts. They are listed below by their *MRS* excavation numbers; the place of publication, by which they will be cited hereafter, follows in parentheses.

a. *Letters* (L):

8.333 (3:7f.)	17.423 (4:193)
15.77 (3:6f.)	20.22 (5:94f., no. 27)
16.03 (3:3f.)	*20.174A (5:90f., no. 25)[1]
17.289 (4:192)	*20.216 (5:108f., no. 35)[1]
17.292 (4:188)	20.237 (5:103, no. 31).[2]
17.385 (4:194)	

b. *Edict*:

     17.334 (4:54f.).[3]

---

[1]These texts are discussed following the list.

[2]Possibly also **4:196f. (17.78). The sender is a certain Ebina'e, who is probably an official of the Carchemish court, mentioned in 3:7:19, and the parallel text 4:188:16. But the text exhibits a number of peculiarities: e.g., the verb form *ti-šap-pa-ra l.*7, which recurs in *PRU* 3:15:15, probably from Khatti; the form *mi-ik-sú-šu l.*14, with a case-vowel before the suffix, a common feature of the U texts (see below, p. 223), but rare in K (below, p. 49). Forms from this text will be cited in the notes, where appropriate.

[3]This text is a replacement copy of an earlier, broken document (cf. *ll.*20ff.). It begins *umma šarrīm-ma* "Thus (says) the king," and then sets out the proper action the king of Ugarit should take in the current war with a third party, and the rewards for the king of Ugarit if such action is taken. Thus, the text resembles a letter in form, but is in fact a record of official foreign policy. As such, it does not fit with any of the other text types.

c. *Treaties* (T):[4]

    17.146 (4:154ff.)   18.19 (4:160)
    17.230 (4:153f.)   18.115 (4:158ff.).

d. *Legal (Juridical) Texts* (J):

    17.59 (4:150f.)   17.317 (4:178f.)
    17.68 (4:164)   17.337 (4:168f.)
    17.108 (4:165f.)   17.341 (4:161ff.)
    17.110 (4:178a)   17.346 (4:176f.)
    17.128 (4:179)   17.352 (4:121f.)
    17.129 (4:166ff.)   17.355 (4:209f.)
    17.145 (4:172f.)   17.396 (4:127f.)
    17.158 (4:169ff.)   18.19 (4:160)
    17.226 (4:208)   19.55 (4:293)
    17.234 (4:173f.)   27.051+19.63 (6:36, no. 35)[5]
    *17.314 (4:189)[6]   27.052 (6:37, no. 36)
    17.316 (4:190b)   1957.1 (*AnOr*48:11f.).[7]

       Three texts, the letters *5:90f. and *5:108f., and
the legal record *4:189, have been included in the corpus
even though their Carchemish origin is not absolutely cer-
tain. The sender of both letters is called simply "the
king" (*umma šarrim-ma*). Addressed to the king of Ugarit,
this could refer only to either the king of Carchemish or
the Hittite emperor. But the latter is always specifically
identified when he sends a letter (for example, *PRU* 4:35ff.;
4:103ff.; 4:188f.), whereas the former refers to himself

---

    [4]C. Kühne, in his "Analytische Liste," *UF* 6, 132, re-
fers to the content of these as "Staatsrechtliches."

    [5]Cf. 4:292f.

    [6]This text is discussed following the list.

    [7]Possibly also **4:171f. (17.42), which is closely
parallel to, and perhaps a copy of a personal record of,
the case described in 4:169ff. Forms from this text will
be cited only in the notes. Note also the tiny fragment
**4:190a (17.449), perhaps a duplicate of *4:189.

merely as "the king" in other letters (4:193; 5:103f.).
Thus, *5:90f. and *5:108f. are to be included here. Further, the content and style of these letters matches other
K letters extremely closely.

Text *4:189 is a legal case argued before a certain
Armaziti, a "son of the king," who also appears in 4:188:9,
a text that is definitely from Carchemish. H. Klengel[8] and
M. Liverani[9] are both convinced that Armaziti is a son of
the king of Carchemish. However, there is some room for
doubt after their arguments. More significantly, a number
of features in this text are peculiar vis-à-vis the rest of
K: for example, the use of the pret. for a prohibition in
*ll.*19,20; the inverted word order in *ll.*26ff.; the Assyrian
statives in *ll.*6,8. The text is *probably* K, but it must be
used with caution.

Several other texts, which Kühne in his "analytische
Liste"[10] marks as possibly of Carchemish origin, have not
been included among the texts upon which the following
study is based. Some have been omitted because they are
mere fragments which contain little or no indication of

---

[8]Horst Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend
v.u.Z., Teil 2: Mittel- und Sudsyrien* (Berlin: Akademie-
Verlag, 1969), 389.

[9]M. Liverani, "Karkemiš nei testi di Ugarit," *RSO* 35,
143.

[10]*UF* 6, 129ff.

of their place of origin.[11]   Others, while more or less

complete, again contain no evidence as to where they were

written, being concerned, not with members of the Carche-

mish court, but with private citizens. The grammar of

these texts is often at considerable variance with that

of texts certainly from Carchemish (for example, unusual

word order). They are *PRU* 4:109f. (17.28);[12] 4:182ff.

(17.319);[13] 4:236a (17.248); 4:236f. (17.251); 4:238

(17.231).[14]

---

[11]*PRU* 3:6a (13.7B); 3:44f. (16.273); 4:108 (18.114);
4:123f. (17.362); 4:124 (17.367); 4:128 (17.348); 4:232ff.
(17.252); 4:237f. (17.66); 6:59f. (no. 58; 17.243).

[12]This text also has two verbs with the WS pl. ending
-*ūna*, attested in none of the texts from Carchemish or
Ugarit: *in-na-am-mi-ru-na* and *i-ṣa-ba-tu_x(ṬU)-na*, both in
l.21.

[13]As Nougayrol notes, one of the witnesses in this
text has the same name *and* filiation as a witness in the
U text 6:39f. (no. 38; 17.355). The grammar too, besides
the word order, is closer to U: e.g., *yānu* in *l*.7; *irtēhi*
in *l*.8; see below, pp. 259, 302f.

[14]This text is listed by Kühne as possibly from Car-
chemish presumably because the PN *Tabrammi*, whose name
occurs twice (*ll*.8,15) is also found in the K text 4:168f.:
2,12,13,22. However, this is not enough evidence to in-
clude the text in our corpus. The grammar more closely
resembles that of U.

B. NOTES ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

a.   Logograms are only sparingly used, and exhibit few unusual features; see also the next section.

b.   Logograms for metals are occasionally followed by MEŠ. It is unlikely that the determinative indicates plurality in such cases. The modifier is sg., e.g., in KÙ. BABBAR.MEŠ (kaspi/a) ša-a-šu "that silver" 4:176f.:13,20.[15] Also, in the same text, KÙ.BABBAR is used interchangeably with and without MEŠ: e.g., 4 li-im KÙ.BABBAR l.4, but with MEŠ in ll.11,15; 4 GUN KÙ.BABBAR l.24, but with MEŠ in l.26; cf. also 5:94f., where KÙ.BABBAR occurs seven times without the determinative, [16] but once with it (l.33). The logogram GUŠKIN (hurāṣu "gold") occurs three times without MEŠ,[17] but with it in 4:209:4. URUDU (erû "copper") is followed by MEŠ twice (4:167:11; 4:209:6), but not in 4:127: 6. UD.KA.BAR (=ZABAR, siparru "bronze") occurs five times, always with MEŠ.[18] On other words, MEŠ probably always signifies that the word is pl.; at least, unlike U (see below, 172ff), there is no evidence to the contrary.

---

[15]Cf. KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ ŠÀM.MEŠ-šu-nu ⌈la(?)-a(?) na-din(?)⌉ 4:293b:7f. If correctly restored, the sentence means: "The silver of their price(s) has not been given"; i.e., the verb is sg.

[16]Lines 8,10,12,15,16,18,26.

[17]4:121:8; 4:127:6; 4:151:17.

[18]4:127:7; 4:167:11,21; 4:179;5,6. In all, MEŠ occurs on logograms for metals 28 times, is lacking 33 times.

c.   In a small number of instances, an extra vowel-sign appears at the beginning of a verb. This feature is common in OB with the G dur., and the D dur. and pret., of verbs I-ʾ,[19] but disappears in MB.[20] Verbs I-ʾ make up most of the examples in K as well: e.g., *i-ir-ru-bu* 4:54:12; *e-el-li* AnOr48:12:14;[21] but there are also instances with other verbs and tenses: *ú-ut-te-er* 4:208:5;[22] *i-iṣ-bá-at* *4:189:5. Most verbs do not exhibit this feature, including almost as many verbs I-ʾ as do show it.[23]

d.   Only one verb form occurs in which the final root consonant is written double:[24] *i-šak-kán-nu-ni-ik-ku* 3:7:23.

---

[19]*GAG* §23d.

[20]J. Aro, *Studien zur Mittelbabylonischen Grammatik, Studia Orientalia* XX (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1955), 21f. (hereafter: *SMbG*).

[21]Other examples are cited below, p.68.

[22]This feature is very common at Boghazkoy, but still almost invariably with verbs I-ʾ (and I-w); cf. Durham, "BoAkk" 11. It is also found at Alalakh, most often with verbs I-ʾ, but, as in K, also with other verbs; cf. G. Giacumakis, *The Akkadian of Alalaḫ* (Paris: Mouton, 1970), §8.21, p. 55 (hereafter: *AkkAl*). At Alalakh, all but one example are in the third person. It must be remembered, however, that 1s verbs are not nearly as frequent in either corpus. The occurrence of this feature in Nuzi is discussed by G. Wilhelm in *UF* 3 (1971), 285ff.

[23]E.g., *e-pa-aš* (Ass.) 4:192:16; *i-mar* ibid.:10; *im-ma-ru* 4:153:14.

[24]Apart from verbs II-w/y and II-ʾ, where such doubling is expected before vocalic endings (*GAG* §104f), e.g., *ut-te-er-ru* 4:173:11. The phenomenon is also attested in only one strong verb in U; see below, 175. At Alalakh, too, only one example occurs; see Giacumakis, *AkkAl* §8.23, p. 56. For Boghazkoy, cf. Durham, "BoAkk" 379f.; elsewhere, cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 73ff.

The parallel text, 4:188:21, has *i-šak-ka-nu-ni-ik-ku*. The doubling of the final radical is probably not a phonological feature (e.g., shift of stress[25]), but a graphic one. The scribe writes the "basic" form of the verb (*išakkan*), and appends an ending to it (here, the 3mp morpheme, and a pronominal suffix), the writing of which acts in part as a phonetic complement, much as is found in writings of the type KUR-*ti* for *māti*. In other words, *i-šak-kán* should be seen almost as a syllabic logogram: *I-ŠAK-KÁN-nu-ni-ik-ku=* *išakkanūnikku*.[26]

e.   There remain a number of unexpected, and inexplicable, doublings of consonants in the script, the phonological value of which is not clear:[27] *ṭe₄-em-mi-i* (if correctly interpreted, for *ṭēmi*, with extra final vowel-sign as well) 3:8:26; and writings of *šākinu* "prefect": LÚ*sà-ki-in-nu* 4:166:8; 6: 36:4; LÚ*sà-ki-in-ni* ibid.:2; but LÚ*sà-ki-nu* 4:162:7'; 4:176f.; 2,3,14.[28]

_____

[25]So *GAG* §20g.

[26]Similarly *I-DIN-nam* for *iddinam*, often in OB (e.g., xxiv:r17; vs. *GAG* §102h); cf. *tal-ta-kán*^{an} 4:122:13. This interpretation was suggested by W.L. Moran. Cf. also S. Lieberman, *Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 45, n. 121; Durham, "BoAkk," 379f. The forms *it-ta-an-nu* 4:174:13' and *it-tan-na-mi* 5:94:15 exhibit the M/NB assimilation of *d* to the following *n* (cf. *GAG* §102 1).

[27]Perhaps due to, or influenced by, Hittite Akk. scribal practice, where it is more common; cf. Durham, "BoAkk," 380ff. The forms *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu* 4:55:23 and IR-*ut-ti* 4:165:8 are Ass.

[28]Note also LÚ*sà-ak-ki-ni* **4:196:2. See the remarks of H.M. Kümmel, "Ugaritica Hethitica," *UF* 1 (1969), 160.

f.   There are a few forms in which an unexpected extra vowel-sign appears: e.g., *za-a-ku* (*zaku*) 6:37:16; *û-ta-a-ar-ra-šu-nu-ti* (*utarraššunūti*) 4:55:15;[29] *ṭe₄-em-mi-i* (*ṭēmi*) 3:8:26.

g.   There are no examples of broken writings (i.e., of the type *par-is* or *mu-ru-iṣ*) in K.

h.   Numerous forms have an *e*-vowel where Bab. would have an *i*. Many of these could be Ass. forms. However, if the difference between *e* and *i* is discounted, there are very few examples that are Ass. on other grounds in K (see below, 91f). And certain forms with an unexpected *e*-vowel cannot be Ass.: *e-ep-pu-uš* 4:54f.:18; *e-ep-pûš-mi* 4:163:35' (Ass. *eppaš*; Bab. *ippeš*, *ippuš*); *a-ma-te*^MEŠ 4:54f.:17 (Ass. has *w* (OA) or *b* (MA) rather than *m*;[30] Bab. *amāti*). In some texts, forms with *e* stand alongside others with *i*: Ass. *e-er-ri-šu* 4:54f.:13, but Bab. *i-ir-ru-bu* ibid.:12 (cf. also *ll*.17,18, just cited); *e-el-li* AnOr48:11f.:14, but Bab. *i-ta-bâ-ak-ši*

29Cf. *i-ta-a-ar* for *itâr* in the same text, *l*.19.

30Cf. *GAG* §21d. In *CAD* A/2, 29ff., under *amatu* and *bēl amati*, there are only three occurrences of *a-ma-(a-)te* in non-WPA texts: one from Susa (*MDP* 18:214:16; cited p. 40b); two from late Ass. royal inscriptions (*OIP* 2:108:vi: 85; Streck, *Asb*. 12: i 128; both cited p. 42a). The rest of the occurrences of this writing (almost invariably followed by MEŠ) are found in texts from Amarna, Boghazkoy, Nuzi, and Ugarit. Clearly, then, *a-ma-te*^MEŠ is not an Ass. form. It is quite odd that, throughout the texts from Ras Shamra, *amātu* and *unūtu* are always written with *-te* in the oblique pl., while very few other words ever are.

ibid.:8,11;[31] *ú-nu-te*^MEŠ *an-nu-ti* 4:167:14; etc. Note also

the following contrast: Ass. *ṣe-e-ṣu* 4:122:27, but Bab.

dì-i-ku 4:170:9,21; 4:174:6'; *ir-te-eh-mi* 5:94:17, but [i]r-

ti-ih 4:166:9; *ir-ti-hu* 4:128:12; 4:208:11.[32] Apart from

eppuš and *amāte* above, it is of course possible to account

for the forms with *e* as Assyrianisms. But since there are

in fact so few of those otherwise, it is much more likely

that the writers of these texts simply did not distinguish

between the writing of *e* and *i*. Most of the forms would

be written as normal Bab., since most of them would have

been learned by rote. This proposal would also account for

the anomalous *eppuš* and *amāte*. The same phenomenon is en-

countered in U, and is discussed more fully there; see be-

low, 177ff.

Note: all verb forms will be transliterated and normalized

with the prime vowel of the sign with which they are writ-

ten, when there are different signs *CE* and *CI* (e.g., *ir-ti-*

hu: *irtíhū*; but *ir-te-eh*: *irtēh*).[33] When a sign is nor-

mally both *CE* and *CI*, the normal Akk. form will be given

----

[31]Note that all other forms in the text are Bab., when
there is a distinction: *ut-te-er-ši* *l*.9 (Ass. *utaʾʾeršī*);
i-ger-re *l*.23 (Ass. *igarre*); *an-nu-ú* *l*.23 (Ass. *anniu*);
i-le-ʾ-e-šu *l*.24 (Ass. *ilaʾʾēšu*).

[32]*irtēh* is not a specifically Ass. form; *AHw*, 979a,
shows that forms of *râhu* with medial *ē* occur in many dia-
lects. The *e* is due to the following *h* (*GAG* §9h). The
point here is that *both* *irtēh* and *irtíh* occur.

[33]Occasionally, for clarity, the correct Bab. form
will be given: e.g., *te-te-nè-pùš-šu* for *tēteneppuššu*.

(e.g., *i-le-eq-qu-û*: *ileqqû*). Most non-verbal forms will be cited in the normal Akk. form, to facilitate reference and comparison.

i.   In over a dozen examples of D and Š pret., perf., and prec. forms, there are only two in which the MB assimilation of *a* to *e* (before *i* in the following syllable) has taken place:[34] *um-te-eš-še-er* 4:150:5 and *um-te-el-lu-û* (by analogy with unattested *umtelli*) 4:172f.:13. A few of the forms without this assimilation are: *li-ma-al-lu-mi* in the same text as the last example, *l.9*; *um-tal-lu-û* 5:95:54; *ul-tal-li-mi* ibid.:21,27; *li-pa-ah-hi-ir-ma-a-mi* 4:163:21',27'.

j.   *ia* has become *â* throughout:[35] e.g., *an-na-a-ti* (from *anniātim*) 4:169:19; [*ta-p*]*a-an-na-ni-šu-mi* (from *tapanniannī-šū-mi*) 4:54:7; *lu-tam-ma-a-mi* (from *lutammiam-mi*) 3:8:16. No forms that would have had *ea* in OB occur.

k.   Initial *w* has been lost: cf. *a-ši-ib-mi* 6:37:10, and other forms of *(w)ašābu*, cited below, p. 70. Intervocalic *w* is written *m*: *a-ma-te*^MEŠ 4:55:7; *û-maš-ša-ru-ka* *5:109:10.

l.   Mimation has been lost word-finally throughout: e.g., on nouns: ^LÚ*a-sí-ru an-nu-û* 3:8:27; *ma-mi-ti* 5:95:52; *nap-ša-ta* 3:8:20; on verbs: *il-la-ka* 4:193:8; *û-ma-al-lu-ni*

---

[34]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 40ff.; no participles of D or Š are attested in K.

[35]Cf. *GAG* §16i,k.

4:156f.:35; on dative suffixes: *il-la-ka-ak-ku* *5:109:r12'.

It continues to appear unambiguously (i.e., with final sign
VM only in a few fixed noun expressions, such as: [*iš-t*]*u*

UD.1.KAM *an-ni-i-im* "from this day" 4:190:1 (but cf. *iš-tu*

UD-*mi an-ni-i* 4:122:26); *ur-ra-am še-ra-am* "in future", e.g.,

4:164:7.[36] That these are fixed phrases suggests that they

are archaisms, and that the final -*m* was never pronounced.[37]

This further implies that all final *CVM* signs are to be read

as CV_x.[38] Mimation is preserved, however, when it is not

final, and it assimilates to the following consonant: e.g.,

ša-ni-im/nim-ma 4:163:25',29'; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* 4:192:8; *ú-ma-*

al-lu-nim-ma 4:156f.:44.

---

[36]This occurs five other times, always with mimation:
4:166a:9; 4:167:20; 4:168:13; 4:-28a:12; 6:37:17. In U
texts, it is found both with and without mimation; see be-
low, p. 187

[37]Swaim's conclusion in "AkkUg", 27, that such forms
indicate sporadic mimation, is linguistically implausible.
The variation, which he finds troublesome, and "hardly...
a matter of historic spelling" in fact does indicate pre-
cisely the tension between learned (or historic) forms (i.e.,
with mimation), and the actual pronunciation.

[38]E.g., *TUM* in *mu-tu₄ nap-ša-tu₄* 3:8:20. Further evi-
dence that -*tu₄* is to be read is found in LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-tu₄-ia*
5:94:27, cf. *l*.25; *i-ṣa-ba-tu₄-ni* 4:155:9; in these, -*tum*
is not possible. Another frequent *CVM* at the end of words
is *LIM*, which must be read *lì*: e.g., É.GAL-*lì-šu* (gen.)
*AnOr*48:12:11,19. With one exception, *LIM* occurs word-finally
only as a phonetic complement to logograms (e.g., LÚ, URU,
É.GAL), vs., e.g., É *ki-lì* in 6:36:6. This suggests that
its use was learned as part of the "paradigms" of these
logograms, and, therefore, that the "paradigms," and thus
the entire writing system, were first borrowed when the
final -*m* was still pronounced, i.e., in the OB period. The
exception mentioned above occurs in 4:176:4: *(PN) 4000
kaspa ana ha-la!-lì(?) ilteqē-mi* "PN has taken 4000 silver
in stealth(?)" (see below, 156). Note that *LIM* is only
rarely used for final -*lì* in MB; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 24.

m.   With the exception of the preposition *ištu*, which is always written *iš-tu*, the change of *š* to *l*, which occurs sporadically already in late OB,[39] always takes place in K: e.g., *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 4:194:8; *il-ták-nu* 4:192:14; *al-ta-ri-iq-mi* 4:179:8; *ri-kíl-ta* 4:154ff.:4,47,48.

n.   When a root-final dental or sibilant comes in contact with *š* of the third person pronominal suffixes, only once does the expected change to -*ss*- take place:[40] DAM-*sú* (i.e., *aššassu*) *AnOr*48f.:7.[41] The other attested forms are: NIN(*ahāt*)-*šu* ibid.:10,18; *qa-at-šu* 4:166:5,7; ÌR(*arad*)-*šu* 4:163:33'; *mu-ut-ši* 5:95:41,46; SAG.DU(*qaqqad*)-*šu-nu* 4:154:18; *te-te-ni-pú̆š-šu* 4:193:12

o.   The verb *sanāqu* is always written with *š* as the first radical in K: *iš-ni-qu* 4:168:4, and often; *na-aš̆-ša-ni-iq-mi* 4:176:7. The final radical of *rakāsu* alternates between *s* and *š*: *ir-ku-us* 4:154ff.:5,47, but *ir-ku-uš̆* 4:163:3 (note *ri-ik-ša* "treaty" in the same line); in 4:160:2', read with Nougayrol probably [*ir-ku*]-*uš̆*. With both these verbs, it is more likely that phonological confusion is involved rather than orthographic, since signs for *s* and *š* are elsewhere always correctly distinguished. The word *sākinu* "prefect" is always written with *sà* (ZA), showing the WS form of the word:

---

[39]Cf. *GAG* §30g; Aro, *SMbG*, 37f.

[40]Cf. *GAG* §30f.

[41]In **4:179:9, note *aṭ-ru-us*-⌈*sú*⌉ (from *aṭrud-šu*).

e.g., 4:161:7'; 4:176:2,3,14.

p.   Nasalization of a voiced double stop, a sporadic
feature of MB,[42] takes place occasionally in K as well:
ma-an-da-ti 4:154ff.:6,28; 4:159:20; *i-ma-an-gur* 4:167:18,
but *i-ma-g[ur]* 6:37:14. The dur. of *nadānu* never shows
nazalition: e.g., [t]a-na-din-ma-a 5:103:r4'.

      The changes *mt→nd* and *nk→ng* do not occur:[43] *um-tal-
lu-ú* 5:95:54; *um-te-eš-še-er* 4:150:5; *kán-ku* 4:177:14,18.

---

      [42]Aro, *SMbG*, 35ff.

      [43]Evidence for other, similar changes (cf. Aro, *SMbG*
38f.) is not attested.

C. MORPHOLOGY

1. *Personal Pronouns*

a. Independent.

These are poorly attested in K. Only nom. forms occur, and only part of the paradigm. Third person forms are listed below, 35f., under the anaphoric pronoun.

ls: *a-na-ku* 4:54:5; ⌈*a*⌉-*n*⌈*a*⌉-*ku(?)* 5:94:10.

2ms: *at-tă* 4:54:6; *at-ta* 4:193:9,17; *5:109:12;

   at-ta-a(?) (broken context) ibid.:17.

lp: *nê-e-nu* 4:169:9',11',17'.

If *i* and *e* were distinct in this dialect (an unlikely situation, see above, 24f.), *nēnu* would be Ass.[44]

b. The emphatic gen. pronoun *attu-* occurs twice. It serves as the predicate in 4:163:3'f.: *šumma at-tu-ni hapīrū...* "The Hapiru...are not ours."[45] The other attestation is in a broken context: ⌉*at-tu-ia*⌈ 4:178:7'.

c. Genitive Suffixes.

ls: ŠEŠ-*ia* (acc.) 6:37:5,(nom.) 7; ZI-*ia* (acc.) 3:8:

   22;[46] *i-na tup-pí-ia* 4:168:5; *it-ti-ia* 3:3:7;

   at-tu-ia 4:178:7'; LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-tu₄-ia* 5:95:22;

   ÌR.MEŠ-*ia* (nom.) 4:168:7; ⌈ZA⌉G.MEŠ-*ia* (acc.)

---

[44]Cf. *ni-i-nu* in a U text (*3:19:24).

[45]This line is discussed in more detail below, pp. 97f. For *attu-* used as a predicate, cf. *CAD* A/2, 513 (*attu*, 2 a).

[46]Note also LÚ-*ia* (acc.) in **4:196:8.

*5:90:9; etc.

The writing of this suffix with the *IA*-sign even when the allomorph -*ī* is expected (as with ZI-*ia*), also occurs in U. Since there are more examples there, discussion is deferred until later (p.193). ŠEŠ-*ia* is for *ahūya* (nom.) and *ahāya* (acc.) in MB.[47]

2ms: *a-na muh-hi-ka* 3:3:4, and p.; ZAG.MEŠ-*ka* 3:6:7;
      etc.

3ms: once -*su*: DAM(*aššas*)-*sú* (acc.) *AnOr*48:11:7;
      otherwise -*šu*: e.g., NIN(*ahāt*)-*šu* (acc.) ibid.:
      10,18; *qa-at-šu* 4:166f.:5,7; ^{GIŠ}*se*$_{20}$-*er-di-šu*
      ibid.:15; $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*ši-bu-tu₄-šu* 5:95:25; rarely -*šú*:
      e.g., ÌR(*arad*)-*šú* (nom.) 4:163:33'; ŠEŠ(*ahū*)-*šú*
      4:193:19 (but HA.LA-*šu* ibid.:10,22).[48]

3fs: once -*ša*: *it-ti-ša AnOr*48:12:15; otherwise al-
      ways -*ši*: ŠEŠ-*ši* ibid.:15; ^{LÚ}*mu-ut-ši* (acc.) 5:
      95:41,46; GÍD.DA(*mūrakī*)-*ši* 4:194:12; DUMU-*ši* 4:
      208:6; GEME₂.MEŠ-*ši* ÌR.MEŠ-*ši* UDU.HI.A-*ši* 4:209:
      10f.[49]

Note that the only occurrence of the correct form of the suffix, -*ša*, is immediately preceded by a word with -*ši* (*AnOr*48:12:15). The almost complete dominance of -*ši* is

----

[47]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 67.

[48]Cf. *ha-ši-ih-ta-šú* (acc.) **4:196:10.

[49]In *5:109:15, it is unclear whether *qa-qa-ri-š[a* or *qa-qa-ri š[a* is to be read.

undoubtedly a levelling through of the acc. suffix (see the following section).[50]

> 1p: *at-tu-ni* 4:162:3'; KUR-*ni* 4:173:3'; etc.
>
> 3mp: SAG.DU*(qaqqad)-šu-nu* (acc.) 4:154:18; ŠÀ-*šu-nu* 3:7b:11; *a-šar-šu-nu-ma-a-mi* 3:7a:15; *aš-ra-šu-nu-ma* 4:188:11; LÚ.MEŠ*da-i-ku-šu-nu* 4:155:8; *ú-nu-te*MEŠ-*šu-nu* ibid.:10; etc.
>
> 3fp: ŠÀ-*bi-šu-nu* 4:168:9, referring to ZI.MEŠ (*nap-šātu*).[51]

d. Accusative Suffixes.

> 1s: [*ta-p*]*a-an-na-ni-šu-mi*[52] 4:54:7; *im-tá-ah-ra-ni* *5:90:7; *im-tah-ra-a*[*n*]*-ni* 5:95:35.

The form of the suffix is Bab. -*anni* (i.e., -*ni* preceded by the ventive morpheme -*am*).

> 2ms: [KÚ]R-*ru(lišṣurū)-ka* 3:6:6; *ú-maš-ša-ru-ka* *5:109:10.
>
> 3ms: *i-du-ku-šu* 4:153:7,13; [*i*]*l-ta-kán-šu-mi* 6:36:6;

---

[50]The suggestion of Giacumakis, *AkkAl* §4.16, p. 33, that the gen. suffix -*ši* is due to Canaanite influence is unfounded, for the only 3fs pronoun in Canaanite with an *i*-vowel is the independent form *hiya* (Hebrew *hī'*). The suffix form was presumably always *-ha* (becoming *-ah* in some dialects.

[51]The sentence is: *šar GN 7 napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīlū 4 sinnišātu...ittadin* "The king of GN gave 7 'souls' --among them 3 men and 4 women" 4:168:8f. -*šunu* may be m. because of the following *amīlū*. But, strictly speaking, -*šina* is expected, referring to f. *napšāti*; perhaps this is one of several examples showing a lack of fp morphological categories; see below, p. 109.

[52]On this form, see below, p. 34, and n. 57.

iℓ-te-e-šu 4:178:5; *aṣ-ṣa-bat-šu-mi* 6:37:9;

etc.; rarely -*šú*: *ip-ta-ṭar-šú* 3:7:10.[53]

3fs: always -*ši*: *ut-ta-ki-ra-aš-ši*[54] *5:109:16;

i-le-ʾ-e-ši 4:208:10; *i-ta-bá-ak-ši* AnOr48:11:8;

etc.

The 3fs acc. suffix has been levelled through as the

gen. suffix as well (see above).

3mp: once -*šunu*: *at-[t]a-ši-˹šu˺(?)-nu* 3:8:26;

otherwise always -*šunūti*: e.g., *ú-na-ak-kàr-*

šu-nu-ti 4:188:4; *ú-ta-a-ar-ra-šu-nu-ti* 4:55:16;

tu-uℓ-te-eℓ-li-šu-nu-ti 4:122:11; etc.[55]

Thus, Bab. -*šunūti* is the normal form of this suffix

in K.

e. Dative Suffixes.

Few examples occur apart from the 2ms, which, apart

from the 1s, is the only dat. sg. suffix to exhibit a for-

mal distinction from its acc. counterpart, since mimation

has been lost (see above, 26f.).

1s: *id-nam-mi* 4:168:7; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11.

The suffix always has the form of the ventive, never

the acc. -*anni*, as occasionally in U (see below, 200f).

---

[53]Cf. also *aṭ-ru-us-˹sú˺* in **4:196:9, the only form
with acc. or dat. suffix in which root-final dental or
sibilant plus pronominal -*š* have become -*ss*.

[54]Possibly dat.; the context is broken.

[55]Other occurrences are :3:7:18; 4:168:6; 4:122:26.

2ms: *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 4:194:8; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* *5:109:

r12'; *il-la-ku-ni-ik-ku* 3:7:21; etc.

The distinction between acc. *-ka* and dat. *-ku* is main-
tained throughout the K texts. Moreover, the dat. suffix
is always preceded by the ventive morpheme, whereas the
acc. is not used with the ventive in any of the few extant
examples.

3ms: *li-šal-lim-šu*[56] 5:95:34; *it-ta-di-in/din-šu* 4:

167:9,17; [*ta-p*]*a-an-na-ni-šu-mi* "you precede me

to him" 4:54:7.

Note that in *tapannânnîšum-mi*, the acc. suffix pre-
cedes the dat., contrary to normal Akk. usage.[57]

2. *Other Pronouns*

a. The Anaphoric Pronoun.

In all dialects of Akk. the third person independent
pronouns are formally (and undoubtedly etymologically)
identical to the forms of the anaphoric (or "far demonstra-
tive") pronoun.[58]   Thus, all forms of both are given here

---

[56]*šu* may be an acc. suffix, in which case *šullumu*
would govern a double acc. here: "to repay someone with
something" (cf. *GAG* §145). However, the clause *x kaspa...
ana PN ultallim-mi* in 5:94f.:13ff.,26f, would argue that
the second object of the verb is indirect: "to pay some-
thing to someone." A further example is found in 4:170:16ff.;
cf. also *AHw*, 1145a (*šalâmu* D 7).

[57]*GAG* §§42e,84h; in a Khatti text, the form occurs
without the dat. suffix: *ta-pa-an-na-a-an-ni-ma   PRU* 4:36:
37.

[58]Cf. *GAG* §41b.

for comparison, although, by coincidence, all the personal

forms are nom., all the demonstrative forms gen. or acc.

(In the following, dem.=demonstrative, pers.=personal; with

the former, ms, etc. refer to the noun modified.)

    ms dem.:   gen.-acc.: *ša* ^{LÚ}DAM.GÀR *ša-a-šu* 4:170:13;

                   KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ[59] *ša-a-šu* 4:177:13,20; KÙ.

                   BABBAR [*ša*]-⌈*a*⌉-*šu*[60] 5:94:13.

      pers.:   nom.: *šu-ú* 4:176f.:18,20; *šu-mi* ibid.:12,16,

                   17; *šu-ú-ut* 4:166:14; 4:193:20,21.

    fs dem.:   gen.-acc.: *mi-id-da-ti ša-a-ši* 4:194:19f.;

                   ⌈*x*⌉ MUNUS-*TUM*[61] *ša-a-ši* 5:95:51; *a-na* MUNUS-*ti*

                   š[*a-a-ši*(?)] ibid.:54; AN.ZA.KÀR[62] *ša-a-šu*

                   4:162:3'.

    mp dem.:   gen.-acc.: *ša* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$DAM.GÀR *ša-a-šu-nu* 4:

---

    [59]MEŠ does not necessarily indicate plurality; see
above, 21).

    [60]This restoration seems more likely than Nougayrol's
[*la-a*](?)-*šu*, a form which does not occur anywhere else in
the Ras Shamra texts. I would suggest the following for *ll.*
10ff.: *u kaspu* [*š*]*a* (Nougayrol: [*an*]*a*) *muḫḫi*[*š*]*u uttaḫḫir-mi
danniš* [*u*] *šar GN 400 kaspa* [*šâ*]*šu mitḫariš ana muḫḫi PN
iltakan-mi* "and the silver which he owed was much in arrears,
so the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN at the same
time." The PN must still be seen as a scribal lapse, Takiya
being intended rather than Mar-Zibaya. P.-R. Berger's pro-
posed [DIŠ]R-*šu* (*UF* 2, 286) makes little sense in the context.

    [61]See below, p. 43, n. 87.

    [62]This form is listed here on the assumption that *dimtu*
(AN.ZA.KÀR) is f. in the sg.; cf. *CAD* D, 144a. Although at
Nuzi one finds *dimtu...ša nadû* (*HSS* 15:1:5,20), and *dimtu...
ḫepi* (*JEN* 525:52ff.), it must be remembered that the m. often
replaces the f. in the stative at Nuzi (Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 220).

156f.:24; *ša* LÚ.MEŠDAM.GÀR *šu-nu-ti* ibid.:

39; ZAG.MEŠ-*ka* *ša-a-šu-nu-[m]a* 4:188:20.

pers.: nom.: *šu-nu-mi* 4:168:5.

fp dem.: gen.-acc.: *aš-šum* ₖ*du-un-na-ti*[63] *ša-a-šu-nu*

4:208:7; *ša* KASKAL.MEŠ*(harranāti)*[64] *ša-a-*

šu-nu 4:176:8; ZI.MEŠ*(napšāti)* *ša-a-šu-nu*

4:173:2'.

The nom. forms *šū* (Bab.) and *šūt* (Ass.) both occur in

legal texts from the reign of Ini-Teshub. Neither these

few occurrences, nor the double occurrence of *šūt* in the

letter 4:193, is enough to determine the typical or most

frequent form of the 3ms nom. in K.

For the gen.-acc. case, the dat. form of the pronoun

is normally used. Once, however, *šunūti*, the true gen.-acc.

form (mp) occurs, in the same text and context as the for-

mally dat. *šâšunu*. The only conclusion possible is that

the two forms were interchangeable, but that the dat. was

preferred. In one instance, *(dimta šâšu)* there is a (proba-

ble[65]) lack of agreement, in which the m. pronoun is used

with a f. noun. F. pl. nouns are apparently always modified

by the m. pl. pronoun.[66]

---

[63]The verb here is *irtīhū*, i.e., 3mp in form, but pro-
bably serving as 3fp as well; see below, p. 109.

[64]*harrānu* is usually f. in the sg., probably always so
in the pl.; cf. the dictionaries, s.v.

[65]See n. 62, above.

[66]On the f. pl. in general in K, see below, p. 109.

b.   The only demonstrative that occurs apart from the anaphoric pronoun (above) is the adjective *annû* "this." It is declined and used like all other adjectives; some examples: ms nom.: *asīru an-nu-û* 3:8:27; fs acc.: *rikilta an-ni-ta* 4:157:47,48; mp gen.: *gabba unûte an-nu-ti* 4:167:14; fp gen.: *3 É.MEŠ an-na-a-ti* 4:169:19. No form of *annû* occurs as a (neuter) substantivized pronoun (i.e. "this thing").

c.   There are no interrogative pronouns attested in K.[67]

d. Indefinite Pronouns.[68]

i. *personal*

Two forms occur: *mamma*, and the peripheral *mannum-mê*.[69] The former is found only in negative clauses: e.g. *ma-am-ma lū lā unakkaršunûtī-mi* "No one may change them" 3:7:17f.; cf. 4:188:13f.;[70] in a negative oath (thus, without a negative adverb[71]): *šumma ana ma-am-ma amīli šanîm-ma...nattadin-mi* "We have not given to any other man" 4:163:25',29'.

---

[67]A possible instance of *am-minî* "why?" is suggested below, 85, under *kīkī*.

[68]All attested forms are cited here.

[69]In texts found at Ras Shamra, this form also occurs in U (see below, 205), and those from Khatti (e.g., *PRU* 4: 65:r9'), Amurru (e.g., *PRU* 4:133:24'). Elsewhere, it is attested in texts from Alalakh, Boghazkoy, and Nuzi; cf. *AHw*, 603b; *CAD* M/1, 218f.

[70]Cf. also **4:197:12f.

[71]The form of the oath is discussed below, 160f.

As the examples show, *mamma* may stand independently, or as an attribute in apposition before a noun.

    mannum-mê occurs once, with *ša*, meaning "anyone (who), whoever": *ma-an-nu-me-e ša rikilta annîta ušašnâ DN₁...DN₆ lū bēlū māmîtîšu* "As for anyone who would alter this treaty, may DN₁...DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:157:48ff. *mannum-mê* is apparently replaced by the impersonal *mînum-mê* in appositional use (see below).

ii. *impersonal*

    Again, there are two forms, with different uses: *mimma* and the peripheral *mînum-mê*.[72] Like *mamma*, *mimma* occurs in negative contexts: e.g., *mim-m[a l]ā habbulāku-mi* "I owe nothing" *4:189:8. In this example, it is independent, and serves as the direct object.[73] In others where it is independent, it is an adverbial acc., meaning "(not) at all, in (no) way":[74] e.g., *RN mim-ma lū lā utarraššunūti* "RN is not obliged to return them at all" 4:54f.:14f.; cf. 4:192: 17ff. Elsewhere, *mimma* stands in apposition after a noun[75] and means "(not) any": e.g., *PN unūtēšu mi-im-ma [ša] tam-*

---

    [72]Also, in texts found at Ras Shamra, in U (see below, 208f.), from Khatti (perhaps *PRU* *3:15:18); Amurru (*PRU* 3: 13c:8). Elsewhere, it is attested in texts from Alalakh, Boghazkoy, Nuzi, and Amarna; cf. *AHw*, 656b; *CAD* M/2, 97f.

    [73]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 74f. (*mimma* a 2' a').

    [74]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 75a (*mimma* a 2' b').

    [75]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 77f. (*mimma* b 2').

kāri...ul ušēli "PN did not produce any utensils of the trader..." 4:170:7ff.; cf. 4:151:19f; 4:167:21ff. (Note that the personal *mamma* stands *before* a noun.) In one instance, the clause with *mimma* is not negative, but a protasis: *(šumma...) RN...dīna mim-ma igerre* "(if...) RN... starts any lawsuit" *AnOr*48:12:21ff.

mīnum-mê, like *mannum-mê*, is not used with negatives. It always stands in construct or apposition[76] before a noun. *mīnum-mê* and *ša* function together as a general relative in the following: *mi-nu-me-e* ZAG.MEŠ-*ka ša* PN *iškunakku ašar-šunū-ma lū ṣabtū* "Whatever borders of yours PN established for you must remain in their place" 4:188:8ff.; cf. the parallel 3:6:11ff.; *mi-nu-me-e* ÌR.MEŠ...*ša libbi* GN₁ *ašbū* RN *lipahher-mā-mi* "RN must gather whatever servants...are living in GN₁" 4:163:26'f. (Note that the pronoun is indeclinable, since it is acc. here.) But in a sentence with the same meaning as the last, *mīnum-mê* itself functions as the general relative:[77] *mi-nu-me-e* ÌR.MEŠ...*ina* GN₂ *ašbū šar* GN₂ *lipahher-mā-mi* ibid.:21'f. In these examples, the pronoun is in apposition to nouns denoting persons, apparently replacing *mannum-mê* in this function. In two other examples, no relative clause is present; in one, *mīnum-mê* is again an attributive: *mi-nu-me-e sinnišāti...amāti...[...] RN...ana*

---

[76]The construction cannot be discerned morphologically, since the noun is always a logogram. In **4:196, both possibilities occur: *mi-nu-um-me-e šul-ma-ni* (bound) *ll*.6f.; but *mi-nu-um-me-e ha-ši-ih-ta-šú* (appos.; acc.) *ll*.10f.

[77]Cf. a similar use of *mannum-mê* in U, p. 205f, and n. 144.

FN [...] *uttēr* ""*RN*...returned to *FN*...all the women...the
maidservants..." 4:209:9ff.; in the other, the pronoun must
be in construct, and mean "everything": *mi-nu-me-e mārat*
RN₁...*ša ina libbi GN mārat RN₁*...*ēpušu gabba ana RN₂*...
irttḥū "Everything of the daughter of RN_1...which the daugh-
ter of RN_1...acquired in GN, belongs entirely to RN_2..." 4:
127f.:5ff.

The phrase *mimma šumšu* "everything" does not appear in
K.[78]

iii.   The pronoun *mimmû* "any/everything of" occurs in K
only with pronominal suffixes, and is indeclinable. The
most felicitous translation of it is "possessions of." All
examples of *mimmû* are given in the list in section ġ., on
gabbu, which always precedes it.

iv.   Finally, there is the form in *aia-nu-ma ša iddūkūšu*
nīdē-mi "We do not know anyone who killed him" 5:95:49f.
(the second clause of an oath after *šumma*). The form[79]
should be normalized *ayyānum-ma* and seen as an extended
form (with -*ān*) of the indefinite adjective *ayyum-ma* "which-
ever" (not attested in K).[80] Since *ayyānum-ma* is the direct
object of *nīdē-mi*, it is apparently indeclinable, like *mī-*
num-mê. Its use seems to parallel that of *mannum-mê*, al-

_____

[78]It does show up in U, however; see below, p. 211.

[79]See *Ug.* 5, 95, n.4. For *IA=aia*, cf. Moran, "Syrian
scribe," 150.

[80]Cf. *GAG* §48h; *AHw*, 26a; *CAD* A/1, 236b.

though the latter does not occur in any negative contexts,
as *ayyānum-ma* does here.

e. *gabbu*.

Though formally a noun, "entirety," *gabbu* is regularly
construed as a pronoun, "all, everything." It occurs only
in legal and treaty texts, as follows:

   1. NÍ.GU₄.MEŠ-šunu unūtēšunu gab-ba (acc.) 4:155:9f.

   2. sinnišāti...huraṣa kaspa [...] gâb-ba (acc.) 4:209:3ff.

   3.] imēru gab-bu mimmûšunu (nom.) 4:159:32

   4. gâb-bâ unūte annûti (nom.) 4:167:19

   5. gâb-bâ unūte annûti (gen.) ibid.:14

   6. gâb-bâ unūte annûti (acc.) ibid.:17

   7. gâb-bâ mimma (gen.) ibid.:22

   8. gâb-bi mimmûšu (gen.) ibid.:16

   9. gâb-bâ mimmûšunu (gen.) 4:121:9

   10. (mīnum-mê mārat RN₁...ša ina libbi GN mārat RN₂...

        ēpušu) [g]âb-bâ ana RN₂...irtīhū 4:128:11f.

When *gabbu* occurs after a series of nouns it is an
independent, catch-all resumptive: "X, Y, Z, everything"
(exx. *1,2*). In such instances, it is probably a fully de-
clined nomen rectus, deriving its case from the sentence.[81]
When it modifies another noun, it invariably stands before
it.[82] The nature of its form in such occurrences is prob-

_____

[81]However, the two instances of this use, both acc.,
are not enough to make this certain.

[82]In MB, and other dialects, it often follows the noun,

lematic, however. Apparently the scribes were not sure how
to construct phrases with it. And with only one example in
which a declinable noun follows (repeated, exx. *4-6*),[83] and
that example probably a frozen form,[84] it is impossible to
determine whether it was construed as a bound form, or in
apposition to the following noun. Two points argue for the
latter option, however: (a) the verb in *4* is pl., indica-
ting that the subject is *unûte annûti* (albeit in the wrong
case; see above and n. 84); (b) *gabba* would be a unique
bound form. The most likely solution is that there were
alternate forms of the pronoun in the scribes' minds, one
fully declined (as in exx. *3,8*), the other simply *gabba*,
indeclinable (as in exx. *4-7,9*).[85]

In ex. *10*, *gabba* is an adverbial acc.; the sentence
should be translated: "Everything of *m*., which *m*. acquired
(lit.: made) in GN, belongs *entirely* to RN$_2$..."

3. *The Noun and Adjective*

a. Declension of the Unbound Form.

i.   In most of the examples, the case-endings are cor-

_____

frequently in the frozen form *gabbi-*, with a suffix, as in
tamertu gabbīša "the whole plain," cited in Aro, *SMbG*, 64;
cf. also *GAG* §134i; *AHw*, 272a (*gabbu* I 2d).

[83]Otherwise, only indeclinable *mimmû* follows.

[84]Note that it is identical for all three cases.

[85]Perhaps on the analogy of *mamma*, *mimma*.

rectly supplied.[86] However, there are a significant number

of scribal errors. A list of nouns and adjectives in K

texts shows seven mistakes in 48 forms in the letters, and

seven mistakes in 91 forms in the remaining texts. That

the latter have only half as many errors (in per cent) is

explained by the fact that they are much more formulaic and

repetitive, and contain more expressions which the scribes

would have learned by rote. The errors follow no observable

pattern, except that many of them are probably due to con-

fused or confusing syntax. The cases most often mixed up

are the nom. and acc.[87] A few typical errors follow.

> *acc. for nom.: mu-ul-la-a akannā-ma* "The fine is the
>
> same" 4:154:23(T), as though a verb (e.g., *umallûni*
>
> "they will pay") should follow, as in 4:156f.:27,34,
>
> 43 (also T).
>
> *tup-pa kân-ku* "the sealed tablet" 4:
>
> 177:14,18 (both times nom.); perhaps influenced by the
>
> (correctly) acc. *tuppa kanka* in *ll*.10,12, although

---

[86]On *e* vs. *i* in the gen., see above, 24.

[87]The wrong vowel occurs for the gen. only once, in a letter: ⌈*x*⌉ MUNUS-*tu₄ ša-a-ši* 5:95:51. The gen. *šinništi* is almost certainly intended. Nougayrol reads *TUM* as *tîm*, but this value occurs nowhere else in texts from Ras Shamra; *AS³* (no. 137) lists it as a rare value, found only in OB and OA. MUNUS.*TUM* should probably be understood as a com-pound logogram, analogous to LÚ.*LUM* in the U text 3:54:12, 14. This is rendered somewhat less likely, however, by the appearance of MUNUS-*ti š[a-a-ši(?)]*(gen.) in *l*.54. The possibility that the form is in fact nom. is mooted below, 45. In 3:3:5, Nougayrol reads *ša* LÚ.MEŠSA.GAZ-*ru(?)*, but the copy suggests that ⌈-*rí*⌉ is equally possible. The two "Winkelhakens" preceding it are the end of the *GAZ* sign.

this does not explain the disparity between the noun

and the adjective, which is correctly marked.

u-nu-te$^{ME\check{S}}$-šu-nu 4:154ff.:41; presu-

mably because the word is nearly always in an oblique

case,elsewhere in the corpus.[88]

nom. for acc.: mu-ul-lu[89]...mārū GN ušallamūni "The

citizens of GN will pay a fine..." 4:154ff.:23ff. The

only apparent explanation is that the object (*mullu*)

is quite far removed from the verb. Perhaps the scribe

initially intended *eli mārī GN* "(the citizens) will owe"

as predicate. But *mu-ul-la-a ušallamūni* occurs in the

same text, *ll.*27,34,43.

1 du-u-du₄ siparra iltariq-mi "he stole

1 bronze kettle" 4:179:6.[90]

---

[88]E.g., in the same text, *ll.*10,16,18,32, and *p.* else-
where. Yet, in the same text again, in a parallel line, we
find u-nu-tu$^{ME\check{S}}$-šu-nu (nom.) *l.*25. In both cases, the verb
is sg. (*ihalliq*). Another incorrect nom. of *unūtu* occurs
in 4:167:19: *gáb-bá* u-nu-te$^{ME\check{S}}$ *an-nu-ti.* That *unūte annūti*
is gen. after *gabba* is unlikely; cf. above, p. 41f.

[89]The defective writing of the final vowel (for *mullû*)
is also unusual.

[90]When a noun is modified by the material of which it
is made, two constructions are possible: (a) the noun de-
noting the material is in apposition to the main noun, in
the same case (*GAG* §134 f β); (b) the main noun is in the
bound form before the material-noun in the gen. (*GAG* §136h).
Both constructions are found in K; note: u-nu-ut UD.KA.BAR
(nom.) 4:127:7, and u-nu-te$^{ME\check{S}}$ UD.KA.BAR (gen.) 4:167:21.
It is impossible to determine which is intended here since
siparru is a logogram, and *dūdu* could be a bound form (see
below, 48f.). Nougayrol's proposal, to read *TUM* as *dàm*, is
very unlikely; *AS³* (no. 137) even questions the existence
of such a value.

There are a number of peculiarities in examples of the expression *ina X qāt PN illi* "PN will forfeit X."[91] Properly, *qātu* is the subject, as for example: *PN₁..litmā-ma ša PN₂ ŠU illi* "Let PN₁...swear, and PN₂ must renounce claim (lit.: the hand of PN₂ must go up)" 5:95:28ff.; cf. *ša mārī GN* [SU-šu]-*nu* [l]*illi* "The citizens of GN must renounce claim" 4:162:4'f. But the syntax becomes confused in the following: *PN ištu...kaspi qātšu ēteli* "PN has forfeited...the silver" 4:166:5, cf. 7. Here, either *PN* is a casus pendens: "as for PN, his hand has gone up"; or, the sense has been turned around (from the Akk. point of view), and *qātšu* must be seen as an adverbial acc.: "PN has gone up with regard to his hand." If the latter interpretation is correct, it would throw light on 5:95:51: ⌜x⌝ MUNUS.*TUM šâši qa-ta li-i-*⌜x⌝ "That woman must renounce claim." Perhaps MUNUS.*TUM* is nom. after all,[92] and *qāta* is an adverbial acc.[93] Finally, there is 3:8:28ff.: *šumma asīru annû... ilteqē-mi* [š]*a(?) PN qa-at*[94] *illī-mi* "If this prisoner has taken..., ..." *CAD* and *AHw* both render the second clause:

---

[91] Cf. *CAD* E, 125 (*elû* 3 b 3'); *AHw*, 208a (*elû* IV G B 8 b-c).

[92] See above, n. 87. If MUNUS.*TUM* is nom. *šâši* would obviously be in the wrong case; *šī(t)* would be expected.

[93] The matter must remain unresolved until the identity of the first and last signs here can be determined. Perhaps *qātā*, nom. dual, should be read.

[94] I can find no explanation for the absolute state here.

"he shall not have any claim on PN."[95] However, when compared with the other examples above, especially 5:95:28ff. and 4:162:4'f., it is clear that the clause must be translated: "PN must renounce (any) claim."[96]

ii.   There are two instances in which the particle *umma* is followed by a syllabically written name; one is: *um-ma* ^{I}*a-li-he-eš-n[i]* 3:6b:1, i.e., in the gen., as elsewhere in WPA.[97] In *4:189:6, we have: *um-ma* ^{I}*pu-ú-uš-ku*, which appears to be nom.; however, this name is probably indeclinable, since the same form occurs for the acc. in *l*.3.

iii.   In 4:154ff., a peculiar alternation is found; note:

    1. LÚ.MEŠ*da-i-ku-šu-nu iṣ-ṣa-ba-tu₄-mi l*.8

    2. *da-i-ku-šu-nu i-ṣa-ab-ba-tu₄-ni l*.30

    3. LÚ.MEŠ*da-i-ku-šu-nu la-a iṣ-ṣa-[b]a-tu₄ l*.36

but *4.* *da-i-ku-ti-šu-nu la-a i-ṣa-ba-tu₄-ni l*.20

    5. LÚ.MEŠ*da-i-ku-ti-šu-nu ni-de-mi l*.23.

    It is possible to construe all the verbs in exx. *1-3* as N duratives, the one in ex. *4* as a G. If that is the

_____

[95]For references, see n. 91, above; *AHw* has: "er verliere den Anspruch auf PN." Nougayrol renders: "que PN s'en porte garant!"

[96]In *ṭēm tuppi annî ku-tal-li itâr* "The stipulations of this tablet become void" 4:55:19f., it is possible that *kutallî* is an adverbial acc. (pl.); however, a more likely solution is that <*ana*> has been omitted. Cf. *CAD* K, 605b (*kutallu* mng. 4).

[97]See R. Marcus, *JCS* 2, 223f.

case, the paradigm of this noun (with suffix) is: nom.:
dāikūšunu; acc.: *dāikūtīšunu*. I can find no reason for this
odd phenomenon. The presence or absence of the determina-
tive complex LÚ.MEŠ seems to follow no pattern.[98]

iv. In *5:91:14, the writing *i-na* ZAG.MEŠ-*ni*⌈ probably
indicates an extended pl. in *-ān* (cf. *GAG* §61i), i.e.,
pāṭānī⌈*šu(?)*⌉.[99]

v. One possible occurrence of the locative-adverbial
ending is: *ki-it-tu₄ altariq-mi* "In truth (or: truly) I
stole (them)" 4:179:8. However, it is also possible that
the form is nom.: "(It is) the truth; I stole (them)."[100]
Otherwise, locative *-u(m)* occurs only in the frozen adver-
bial form *ašrānu*; see below, 84, s.v.

vi. The terminative-adverbial ending *-iš* occurs only in
three frozen adverbial forms: *danniš*, *mithāriš*, and *ṭābiš*;
see below, 84ff., s.v.

b. The Bound form before Nouns.

The following are all the syllabically written examples:

_____

[98]Cf. also LÚ.MEŠ*da*<*i(?)*>-*ku-ti-šu-nu*⌈ 4:159:21.

[99]So also Nougayrol's normalization. Although this pl.
is not attested elsewhere for *pāṭu* (*AHw*, 851 f.), it makes
little sense in the context to take *-ni* as a 1p suffix, as
P.-R. Berger does (*UF* 2, 286). (*L*.12 should still be read
⌈*a*⌉-*di-ni* with Nougayrol, vs. Berger, ibid.)

[100]So *AHw*, 494b (*kittu(m)* 2 d); cf. *CAD* K, 472b (*kittu*
2 d).

Sg.: *ṭeₐ-em tuppi* (nom.) 4:55:19; *ištu le-et PN* 4:165: 6; *ina huḷ-ud libbīšunu* 3:7:11; *aššum di-ni sin-ništi* 5:95:40; *ištu ša a-ba-a-bi šarri* 4:55:20; *ana muḫ-ḫi PN* 5:94:8, and p.; *ina ŠÀ-bi GN* 4: 155f.:7,29.

Pl.: *beḷ-lu māmītīšu* 4:157:53; *pu-ḫi ardīya* (acc.) 4: 168:7; *ana pa-ni aḫḫī* 4:157:39; cf. 4:179:7 *ú-nu-ut siparri*[101] 4:127:7.

The only example not in accord with regular OB and MB formation of the bound form before nouns is the fourth (*dīni*);[102] the bound form is almost invariably *dīn*.[103] Here perhaps *dīni* is analogous to the alternate bound form ex-hibited by other nouns of the type *pūs*, e.g., *qāti*.[104]

c. The Bound form with Suffixes.

Nouns in the gen. (sg. and pl.) with suffixes exhibit no peculiarities whatsoever.[105] Thus, only nom. and acc. forms are listed below:

---

[101]On this construction, see above, p. 44, n. 90.

[102]Cf. *GAG* §64; Aro, *SMbG*, 66f.; for *gabbu* before nouns, see above, 41f.

[103]*CAD* D, 150ff., gives only one example in which the gen. bound form is *dīni* (p. 152b, citing Borger, *Esarh.*82 r 20, i.e., a SB royal inscription), beside many examples of *dīn*.

[104]Cf. *GAG* §64c, and Anm.

[105]E.g., sg. *ina tup-pī-ia* 4:168:5; pl. *qadu* LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-ti-šu* 5:95:28,32. The form ŠEŠ(?)-*e-ka* 3:4:10 is pro-bably gen., but the context is broken.

Sg.:   LÚ*mu-ut-ši* (acc.) 5:95:41,46; *a-šar-šu-nu-ma-a-mi*

(acc.) 3:7a:15; *aš-ra-šu-nu-ma* (acc.) 4:188:11;

qa-at-šu (acc.?/nom.?) 4:166:5,7.

Pl.:   LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-tu₄-ia/-šú* (nom,) 5:94f.:22,25; *di-*

ni-šu (acc.)[106] ibid.:37; (LÚ.MEŠ)*da-i-ku-šu-nu*[107]

(nom.) 4:155f.:8,30,36; (LÚ.MEŠ)*da-i-ku-ti-šu-nu*[107]

(acc.) ibid.:20,23; *ú-nu-tu*MEŠ*-šu-nu* (nom.) ibid.:

25; *ú-nu-te*MEŠ*-šu-nu* (nom.)[108] ibid.:41, (acc.)

*l.*10; cf. 4:170:7.

Only the third example (*ašrašunū-ma*) requires further

comment; from the viewpoint of native Akk., it is incorrect

in that the suffix is attached not to the bound form, but

to the noun with a case-vowel.[109]   The correct form occurs

in the previous example, which is found is exactly the same

context.[110]

---

[106]The sentence is: *inanna di-ni-šu ša-al-ma,* which
Nougayrol renders: "maintenant: son affaire est reglee."
However, better sense is afforded if the verb is taken as
an imper. of *ša'ālu* (see below, p. 69, n. 171), in which
instance *di-ni-šu* is acc. Although the pl. of *dīnu* seems
most often to be f. (i.e., *dīnātu*) in the Ras Shamra texts,
AHw, 171b, notes that it can also be m.

[107]See above, 46f.

[108]See above, 42.

[109]In **4:196f., note also *ha-ši-ih-ta-šú* (acc.) *l.*10,
and *mi-ik-sú-šu* (acc.) *l.*14.   The latter is another example
of a case-vowel before the suffix, albeit an incorrect one
(Ass. vowel harmony?).   *hašihtašu* could be another such
example; however, the form is also correct in native Akk.

[110]3:6f.:9-16=4:188:8-12; the only other difference
between the two passages is the addition of *-mi* in 3:7a:15.

If the forms above are typical of the K dialect, it must be concluded that proper Akk. forms predominated. Whether *ašrašunū-ma* is to be considered simply a scribal error, or whether it represents an underlying (WS?) dialect, in which pronominal suffixes were regularly placed after the case-vowel (i.e., a dialect in which bound forms retained case-endings),[111] cannot be determined on the basis of only one form. In U, a case-ending in the bound form predominates; see below, pp. 219ff.

d. The Absolute State.

With one exception, only numerals occur in the absolute state in K: e.g., *1-en* (i.e., *ištēn*) *5:90:10; *5:108:6; *me-at* 4:160:5',9', and *p.*; *li-im* 4:166:8, and often. The exception is *qa-at* in 3:8:29, quoted above, p. 45.

e. There are no occurrences of the predicative state of the noun (e.g., *šarrāku*). The stative is treated under the morphology of the verb.[112]

---

[111]This is the case with all WS dialects. The feature is preserved in Ugaritic (see below, p. 224, n. 214). For classical Arabic, cf. Wright, *GAL*, I §316, p. 251. In Hebrew and Aramaic, diachronic reconstruction reveals that the feature was present at earlier stages of the languages, before all short final vowels were lost; e.g., in Hebrew, the vowels before suffixes reflect the case-endings homophonous with the original vowels of the suffixes (T.O. Lambdin): e.g., on *kōl* "all": 2ms *kullāk* (Michah 2:12)<*kulla-kā* (acc.); 2fs *kullēk* (Isaiah 14:29)<*kulli-kī* (gen.); 3ms: *kullōh* (Isaiah 15:3)<*kullu-hū* (nom.); 3fs: *kullāh* (Isaiah 48:6)<*kulla-hā* (acc.).

[112]See the discussion in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

4. *The Verb*

a. The Markers of Person.

i. *imperative*

Only the ms occurs (thus, with ∅-marker for person);
e.g.:

G: [*š*]*u-ku-un-šu* *5:109:r14'; *a-lik* ibid.:r6';

   id-nam-mi 4:168:7.

D: *te-er-ra-aš-šu-nu-ti* 4:168:6.

Š: *šu-ši-ir* 4:192:15.

ii. *durative, preterite, perfect*

The 1s prefix in the G is *a-*: e.g., *ap-r*[*u-u*]*s* 3:7:11, or, with Bab. vowel harmony, *e-*: e.g., *e-qè-er-re-bu* 4:54: 6. A prefix *i-* never occurs, as is sometimes the case in letters in the Amarna tablets.[113] In the Š, the sole form has *u-*: *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 4:194:8. No 1s D or N forms occur.

The prefix of the second person (only 2ms occurs) in the G is normally *ta-*: e.g., *ta-ta-na-din-ma* (Gtn) 4:193: 16; with Bab. vowel harmony, *te-*: e.g., *te-qè-re-e*[*b*] *5: 91:15. As in most dialects, *ti-* is found with the verb *edû*: e.g., *ti-i-de₄-šu* 4:193:18.[114] No N, D, or Š forms occur.

---

[113]Cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 54f. *edû* is not attested for 1s.

[114]Cf. *GAG* §106q; *AHw*, 187f. *ti-* as prefix for the second person is common at Alalakh; cf. Giacumakis, *AkkAl* §8.21, p. 57. It is also found in one text that is possibly K, **4:196:7: *ṭe-ma ti-šap-pa-ra* "Send me news." Nougayrol divided the words after *-ti*, i.e., *ṭēmāti šappara*. This, however, creates *two* unusual forms, for the pl. of *ṭēma* is m., and the imper. of *šapāru* is *šupur* (*šupra* with ventive).

In the 3ms and 3mp, the only non-MB feature is that the prefix of verbs I-' is sometimes written *e*, as in Ass., rather than *i*: e.g., *e-er-ri-šu* 4:54:13 (but *i-ir-ru-bu* ibid.:12. These forms are discussed above, 24f. There are no third person forms with *y-* prefix, and no 3mp forms with *t-* prefix, or with the ending *-ūna*.

The following are all the occurrences of the 3fs:[115]

>   *FN...it-ta-ra-aṣ* 4:167:17;

>   *ša FN...ū-ka-[a]l-lu* 4:208:3;

>   *ša...mārat RN...e-pu-šu* 4:127:9f.;

>   *mārat RN...lā i-ra-gu-um* 4:128:13ff.;

>   *FN...lā i-ra-gu-um* 4:210:17;

>   *lā e-el-li* AnOr48:12:14;

>   *šarrat GN...ti-it-ta-din-ma...tu-ul-te-el-li-*

>   *šu-nu-ti u...ta-al-ta-kán^{an}* 4:121f.:7ff.

Thus, the form of the 3fs in K is normally identical to the 3ms. It differs from the latter in only one text (but there consistently), where it has a *t-* prefix. The

---

Even if taken as a unique D of *šapāru*, the imper would be *šuppira* (or *šappira* in Ass.). It is likewise an improbable WS form. Perhaps pretonic reduction (i.e., *təšappara*) is indicated. Note that the same expression and form occur in *PRU* 3:15:15, probably from Khatti.

    [115]Several others are possible or even probable: [*adi nukurtu(?)...] iggammar* 4:151:6; *FN[...]...gabba ša ina* [...] *ul-te-ri-ib* 4:209:2ff.; and three grammatically difficult passages involving the idiom *qāt X illi*, in which *qātu* (f.) should be the subject (see above, 45f.): 3:8:29 (*li-i-li-mi*); 4:166:5,7 (*e-te-li*); 4:162:4'f. (*li-i-li*). The idiom also occurs in 5:95:30,51 (*li-(i-)li*), but there it is not certain that *qātu* is the subject. Note that in all these instances, the verb has the same form as the 3ms.

t- occurs with three vowels; that of *tultelli̊sunūti*

presents no problem, but what is the difference, if any,

between the *a* and *i* in *taltakan* and *tittadin-ma*? No solu-

tion seems obvious.[116]

    First pl. verbs are the following:

    L: *ni-id-du₄-ku* 5:95:48; *ni-i-de₄-mi* ibid.:50.

    T/J: *ni-de-mi* 4:156:23; *ni-de₄-mi* 4:162f.:10';

           ni-de₄-e-mi ibid.:20'; *na-ak-ki-is-mi* ibid.:9';

           cf. *l.*12; *na-at-ta-na-din-mi* ibid.:18';

           na-at-ta-din-mi ibid.:25',29'; *na-at-ta-kir-mi*

           ibid.:24',25',29'; *na-as̆-s̆a-ni-iq-mi*[117] 4:176:7.

    Unfortunately, since these examples come from only

four texts, and only two (from the same text) àre from let-

ters, few conclusions can be drawn with certainty. If they

are typical, it would appear that in the letters, the lp

prefix was *ni-*, whereas elsewhere, apart from the verb *edû*,

it was *na-*. The latter prefix is non-Akk., and its origin

must be sought in some substrate language, presumably a WS

dialect.[118]

---

    [116]Since the forms are perfects rather than preterites,
the prefixes cannot be examined on the basis of the Barth-
Ginsberg rule (i.e. *yaqtul* and *yaqtil*, but *yiqtal*).

    [117]On this form, see below, pp. 66f.

    [118]If the forms in the treaties and legal texts are
due to WS influence, note that *nakkis-mi* follows the Barth-
Ginsberb rule. Further, *nīde* could also represent an

3mp verbs are discussed with 3ms, above.

The only verbal clause with a f. pl. subject is: *ana
šar GN ir-ti-hu* "they remain with the king of GN" (refer-
ring to * Édu-un-na-ti šašunu* "those fortified estates") 4:
208:11.   Although both the modifying pronoun and the verb
are m. in form, the noun is probably f. pl.; *šašunu* is
used with other f. pl. nouns.[119]   Thus, the 3mp of the
verb, like *šašunu*, seems to have supplanted its f. counter-
part.[120]

iii. *precative*

Bab. forms are used throughout: e.g., 1s: *lu-tam-ma-
a-mi* "let me adjure" 3:8:15; *li-iq-bi* "let him say" ibid.:
16; *li-šal-li-mu* "let them pay" 4:170:15. No 3fs forms
occur.[121] Also, no examples of the 1p injunctive are
found.

---

underlying WS form, in which case it too might be fol-
lowing the same rule, provided an original *yadaᵃ* had al-
ready become (*yadaᵃ→) *yidaᵃ*. But this seems less likely
than simply considering *nide* to be a form the scribes
learned well, since the verb is so common.

[119]See above, p. 36.

[120]This is true of the perfect (i.e., *qāṭal*) form in
Hebrew as well. On the f. pl. in general, see below, p.
109.

[121]An inanimate 3fs may occur if *qātu* is the subject
in [ša]a PN *qa-at- li-li-i-mi* "let PN renounce claim (lit.:
let the hand of PN go up)" 3:8:29 (and cf. 5:96:30; 4:162:
5'). However, the syntax of this idiom may be confused in
K; see above, pp. 45f.

iv. *stative*[122]

The personal suffixes of the stative present no pro-
blems. Only two forms occur that are not third person;
both are Ass.: 1s: *ha-bu-la-ku-mi* *4:189:8; 2ms *ha-bu-
la-tá-mi* ibid.:6. One other D is found; it is the same
verb, but Bab. 3ms: *hu-ub-bu-ul(-mi)* 5:94:10,20.

All other statives are G; examples of strong verbs
are: 3ms: *ša-li-im* 4:177:19,25; 3fs: *šal-ma-at* 5:95:26;
3mp: *ša-aṭ-ru-mi* 4:168:6.[123]

b. The Ventive.

The ventive occurs without mimation, except when not
final, in which case the *m* assimilates to the following
consonant.[124] After sg. verbs,[125] it is -*a(m)*: *il-la-ka*
4:193:8; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* 4:192:8; after pl. verbs, it is
-*ni(m)*:[126] *ú-ma-al-lu-ni* 4:156f.:36; *ú-ma-al-lu-nim-ma*
ibid.:44.

There are differences in the use of the ventive that
depend on the text genre. In the letters, it is quite
consistently employed to indicate motion to a point

---

[122]The treatment of the stative in this study is dis-
cussed in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

[123]The form *ša-al-ma* (5:95:38) is probably an imper.
of *ša'ālu*, not a 3fp stative of *šalāmu*; see below, 69, n. 171.

[124]Mimation in general is discussed above, pp. 26f.

[125]Neither 2fs nor 1p forms occur with the ventive.

[126]Never -*ne*, as in M/NA.

near the speaker. As such, it frequently denotes the 1s

dat., and always occurs with the verbs *šapāru* and *šūbulu*:

e.g., *tàš-pu-ra* "you sent/wrote to me" 3:3:6, and *p.*; *šu-*

bi-la "send to me" 4:191:11; *it-tan-na-mi* "he gave to me"

5:94:15. Since the speaker places himself in the company

of the addressee, motion toward the latter is also indica-

ted by the ventive: e.g., *il-la-ka* "he is coming (here,

where you are)" 4:193:8. It is this use that results in

the occurrence of the ventive with the second person dat.

suffix; in K, this happens without exception:[127] e.g., *ul-*

te-bi-lak-ku "I (hereby) send to you" 4:194:8; *iš-ku-na-*

ak-ku "he established for you" 3:7a:14.[128] Note that the

ventive does not appear with the only example of a third

person dat. suffix: *li-šal-lim-šu* "he must pay to him"[129]

5:95:34.

　　The ventive always precedes the 1s acc. suffix: e.g.,

im-tah-ra-a[n]-ni "he approached me" 5:95:35.[130] Otherwise,

it occurs with an acc. suffix only once in 12 examples; un-

fortunately, the exception is in a broken context, and it

---

[127]The lack of exceptions makes it equally possible
that the scribes simply learned *-akku/-nikku* as the second
person dat. suffixes.

[128]Cf. also 3:6f.:10,21,23; 4:192:8. In 4:188:18,
for Nougayrol's *al-tap-ra-aš[-šu(?)]*, read probably *al-tap-*
ra-a[k-ku]. The copy, after *RA*, has ⟨⟩; cf. the *AK* in
*l.*10.

[129]That the suffix here is dat. was argued above, p.
34, n. 56.

[130]Other examples above, p. 32.

is even possible that the suffix is dat.: *ut-ta-ak-ki-ra-aš-ši* "he removed(?) her(?)" 5:103:16.

The reason for the occurrence of the ventive is obscure in only one other example in the letters: *arad PN lu-tam-ma-a-mi* (*lutammâm-mi*) "I will adjure PN's servant" 3:7f.:14f. Perhaps some nuance such as "here, in my presence," or even the 1s dat. ("I will make...swear to me"), is intended.

In the legal texts, very few examples of the ventive occur. In a number of cases, the nuance is that found in the letters: e.g., *te-er-ra-šu-nu-ti-mi...id-nam-mi* "return them to me...give to me" 4:168:6f.; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* "he made for me" 4:176:11. With a verb of motion, note: *it-ta-na-la-ku-ni[m]-ma-a-mi* "they keep coming here" 4:162:15'.[131] In one instance, the ventive seems to serve no purpose: *šumma ina arki ūmi tuppa kanka...ú-še-la-a* "if in future he produces a sealed tablet..." 4:169:18ff.; cf. *šumma arki tuppi annî amīlī...ú-še-êl-lu-ú* "if after this tablet (is completed) they produce men..." 4:163:30'.

In *4:189:18ff., the following clauses occur: *amīlu a[na amī]li lā i-tù-ra māru ana māri lā i-tu-ur* "Man shall not return against man (for legal action); son shall not return against son." As will be seen below (151), the pro-

---

[131]But note that the next verb in this text, with the same implications of direction, does not have the ventive: *ina libbi mātīni ih-ta-nab-bâ-tu-mi* "they keep making incursions into our land" 4:162:15; similarly, *ll.19,20*.

hibitive in K is regularly *(lū) lā* plus the dur. While
i-tū-ra can be interpreted as a dur. (*iturra*), *i-tu-ur* can-
not. Thus, the forms more likely reflect WS usage, where,
in some dialects at least, the prohibitive is: negative
adverb plus **yaqtul*.[132] If this is in fact the case, per-
haps *i-tū-ra* does not exhibit the ventive, but rather WS
*yaqtula, which is sometimes equivalent to **yaqtul*.[133]

Two of the three treaty texts promulgated by Ini-
Teshub, dealing with the murder of foreign merchants, are
very similar in their format and content: 4:154ff. and
4:158ff.[134] It is possible the two were written by the
same scribe. The use or non-use of the ventive in them is
very peculiar vis-à-vis normal Akk. and the rest of K.
First, it should be noted that the ventive appears only
once on a sg. verb, and for no apparent reason: *ū-ša-aš-na-a*
"(whoever) alters (this treaty)" 4:154ff.:49. On pl. verbs,
it is rampant, but not predictable; it occurs on all exam-

---

[132]For the Canaanizing dialect of the Byblos Amarna
texts, see Moran, "Byblos," 49ff.; for Arabic, see Wright,
GAL, II, §17b, p. 36; for Hebrew, note the occasional use of
ʾal plus the short (jussive) imperfect form; cf. Joüon,
GHB, §114i-j, pp. 310f.

[133]E.g., in the Amarna letters from Byblos; cf. W.L.
Moran, "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29 (1960), 1ff.;
Moran discusses the evidence of Hebrew and Arabic as well,
pp. 12f.

[134]In the other legible treaty, 4:153f., which is much
shorter, and does not have the same format, the ventive
does not appear at all, even though some of the same verbs
occur: e.g., *i-ṣa-ab-ba-tu₄* *l.*8; *ū-ma-al-lu-ū* *l.*14. Text
4:160 is badly broken.

ples of *šullumu* (seven times[135]), *mullû* (two[136]), *alāku*
(four[137]), *qabû* (two[138]), but on only *some* examples of
ṣabātu,[139] *tamû*,[140] and *dâku*.[141] For only one or two of
these verbs—*alāku*; *qabû*(?)—could the ventive possibly
have its normal function, for the verbs are all third per-
son. It seems possible, therefore, since all the pl. verbs
with the ventive in these two texts are dur., that the
scribe(s) misunderstood its function, and associated it
with the WS pl. imperfective morpheme *-ūna*. This hypothesis
is supported by the following contrast: dur., always *i-tam-
mu-ni* (4:154ff.:16,22,40), but prec. *li-it-mu-û/-ma* 4:158ff.:
23,30. However, there are a number of problems with the
proposal: (a) it is not certain the two texts, which each
attest only one of these last forms, are by the same scribe;
(b) the examples of the pl. dur. without *-ni* remain unex-
plained; (c) it seems unlikely that a scribe would use *-ni*

---

[135]*ú-šal-la-mu-ni*: 4:154ff.:11,17,18,22,23; 4:158ff.:
18,25.

[136]*ú-ma-al-lu-ni*: 4:154ff.:35,44.

[137]*il-la-ku-nim-ma*: 4:154ff.:21,37; 4:158ff.:7,14.

[138]*i-qa-ab-bu-ni*: 4:154ff.:11,33.

[139]With *-ni*: 4:154ff.:19,20,30; with no ending: 4:
154ff.:36; 4:158ff.:13(?); further, twice with *-mi*: 4:
154ff.:8; 4:158ff.:6. Some of these are quoted above, p. 46.

[140]Cited below.

[141]*i-da-ku* 4:154ff.:29; *i-du-ku-mî* ibid.:8; *i-du-ku-ni*
4:158ff.:21. These are probably all N dur.; see below, p.
131, n. 368.

for his morpheme -na. Nevertheless, no other solution presents itself.

d. The Subjunctive.

The subjunctive -u occurs in K in over half the instances in which it is expected.[142] The Ass. subjunctive particle -ni probably never occurs; all the forms with final -ni are plural, and so the ending should be taken as the ventive marker (see above) in those cases.

In the letters, the subjunctive is found on only one of the two verbs where it should appear; both verbs are in the same text: ayyānum-ma[143] ša id-d[u₄]-ku-šu nīdē-mi "We do not know anyone who killed him" 5:94f.49f. The other example is: ša ana muhhīya hu-ub-bu-ul "which was owed to me" ibid.:20.[144] Since enūma does not seem to be a conjunction in K,[145] the subjunctive is not found in the clauses which it begins.[146]

---

[142]I.e., on verbs in subordinate clauses, where such verbs are not already marked at word end by another morpheme (such as pl. -ū/-ā, the ventive, or the stative suffixes).

[143]On this word, see above, p. 40.

[144]On the basis of only two exx., it is impossible to determine whether this scribe considered that relative clauses did not require the subjunctive, or whether he was simply unfamiliar with the form in general; cf. also the next paragraph. In the letter **4:197:16f., the expected -u does not appear: adi...a-ši-ib "as long as he...resides."

[145]See below,140ff. enūma occurs only in the letters.

[146]Only one would show the -u if enūma were a conjunction: enūma...at-[t]a-ši-šu-nu 3:8:25f. Cf. also **4:196:8f.

The subjunctive is also found in an oath formula, in the same text as the above examples: *šumma mutši ša sin-ništi u ahi PN ina āli ni-id-du₄-ku* "We did not kill the woman's husband or PN's brother in the city" 5:95:45ff.[146a] According to *GAG* §185g-i, the subjunctive in oaths introduced by *šumma* is an Ass. phenomenon (although there are very few Bab. examples to consider). However, by this period in Ass., we should expect the particle *-ni* to follow the form as well.[147] A further problem is that the next verb in a main clause, *ni-de₄-mi* (*l.*50), is governed by the same *šumma*, and is not subjunctive. It is noteworthy that the only two subjunctive forms in the letters occur in successive lines. Perhaps the second (*iddūkūšu*) influenced the form of the first, creating a scribal error.

In other types of texts, the subjunctive is more frequent. It occurs 11 times, but is lacking in nine other instances where it is also expected. A few examples with the subjunctive are: *ša tamkāri šâšu ša ina GN di-i-ku* "of that trader who was killed in GN" 4:170:13f. (similarly in *ll.*8f.,20f.); *dunnāti...ša FN...ú-ka-[a]l-lu* "the fortified estates...which FN...holds" 4:208:2f.[148] Only one example is not a relative clause: *lām anāku ina GN e-qè-re-bu* "before I approach GN" 4:54:5f.

[146a]This note appears on the following page.

[147]*GAG* §83b.

[148]Cf. also 4:54f.:10,18; 4:127:10; 4:153:7,13; 4:170:9,21; 4:176f.:15,18(perhaps also 11,22, unless pl.); and cf. **4:171:5,13.

146a Both A.F. Rainey (*IOS* 5, 24) and P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2, 287) have suggested reading instead: *šumma...ina alīni idduku* "(they)...were not killed in our city." The verb could thus be a G perf. 3mp impersonal (or perhaps even N pret.). Obviously, this is a much better reading grammatically. However, it is contextually impossible; it is the men of GN who are to swear this oath, and the text in *ll*.41f. says clearly that the two men *were* killed in GN. The purpose of the oath was not to deny the facts; rather, it was to deny that the men who took it either committed the crime themselves, or knew who had done it. An exact parallel to this type of double disclaimer is found in 4:162:9'f.: *šumma karānīšunu nēnu nakkis-mi u šumma amīlī ša karānīšunu ikkisū nīdē-mi* "We did not tear down their vineyards, nor do we know the men who tore down their vineyards." Thus, the difficult 1p verb in 5:95:45 must remain.

Of the nine instances where an expected subjunctive does not occur, six are in the caveat: *ša iraggum tuppu annû ile'²ēšu* "This tablet will defeat whoever brings suit."[149] The lack of the subjunctive ending in these cases is undoubtedly due to the great number of times *iraggum* occurs in other, non-subjunctive clauses. The scribes would simply have become accustomed to writing only this form.[150] The other three forms without -*u* where it should appear can only be explained as scribal lapses. One occurs after the conjunction *undu*[151] "while, when": *un-[d]u šar GN ittīya ik-ki-ir*[152] "when the king of GN was at war with me" 4:54:1f. The remaining two examples are in broken contexts, but it is fairly certain in each case that the verb is in a subordinate clause: *[adi(?) nukurtu ša] GN ig-gām-mar* "until(?) the war with GN is finished" 4:151:6; *gabba ša ina [....] ul-te-ri-ib* "everything which she brought into ...." 4:209:5f.

Finally, there is one case where the subjunctive may appear, incorrectly, in the protasis of a conditional sentence: *šumma ina arki ūmi RN ardīšu e-er-re-šu* "if in

---

[149] 4:168:26f.; 4:169:24f.; 4:161:24f.; 4:173:19f.; 4:179:16f.; 6:36:r4'f.; cf. also **4:172:21f.

[150] Occasionally, *iraggum* is written even when the subject is pl.: e.g., 4:171:22ff.; see below, p. 107.

[151] See below, pp. 139f.

[152] ⌈*ir*⌉ (so Nougayrol) appears in the copy to be more likely than ⌈*ru*⌉, which would make the form subjunctive.

future RN demands his servants (back)" 4:54:12f. However,
the form could just as easily be an incorrect pl. Another
possible, though less likely, instance of the same ilk (4:
163:30') is cited below, p. 108.[153]

d. The Derived Conjugations.

Forms of the G occur *p.*, with no unusual features:
e.g., dur.: *i-dáb-bu-ub* (3ms) "he (may not) speak" *AnOr*48:
12:15; pret.: *tàš-pu-ra* "you wrote to me" *p.* in the letters;
perf.: *al-ta-ri-iq* (1s) "I stole" 4:179:8; etc. Only two
problematic forms occur. One is the dur. *i-na-ah-sú* "(if)
they shrink back (from the oath)" 5:95:53. It is much more
likely that this is a scribal error, for *i-na-ah<-hi>-sú*,
than a case of the syncopation of an entire syllable.[154]
Second, the form written *ah-ta-bat-ma* in 4:54:7, which
should be second person, is undoubtedly also a scribal er-
ror, for *tahabbat-ma!*.[155]

───────────────

[153]A similar phenomenon occurs in a U text: *6:3:27;
see below, pp. 242f., n. 295.

[154]Cf., in the same text, *i-na-ak-ki-ru* l.31; else-
where in K, note *i-na-ah-hi-sú* 4:162:6'.

[155]The clause is: *šumma atta RN ah-ta-bat-m*[a ta]*pan-
nánntšum-mi* "If you, RN, attack and precede me to him";
thus, the form must be 2ms. Further, it is in the protasis
of a conditional sentence, with reference to the future; in
such cases, the verb is always dur. in K (see below, 131f.).
Finally, note *ta-ha-bat-mi* in the next line, and also the
parallel in a text from Khatti: *šumma atta RN* [t]*a-ha-bat-ma
tapannánnt-ma PRU* 4:36:35ff.
   i-da-ku in 4:156:29 is probably an N; see below, 131, n. 368.
For *na-at-ta-kir-mi* in text 4:161ff., see the D, below.

The Gtn[156] dur. occurs in the following: *mārū GN₁ ana*

mārī GN₂ NÌ.KAŠ *it-ta-na-di-nu-mi it-ta-na-la-ku-ni[m]-ma-*

a-mi ina libbi mātīni ih-ta-nab-bá-tu-mi "The citizens of

GN₁ keep giving beer(?) to the citizens of GN₂. They are

constantly coming and making incursions into our country"

4:162f.:14'f., cf. 18'ff.; *[il]-ta-na-ri-iq-mi* "he kept

stealing" 4:176:6. The form *im-ta-ha-[ṣu-m]i* in 4:162:4'

in probably a Gtn pret. (*imtahhaṣū-mi*); why the Gtn was

used here, instead of the G *im-ha-ṣu* as in the previous

clause, is not clear.

Examples of the D are: *lū lā ū-na-ak-kàr-šu-nu-ti-mi*

"may not change them" 4:188:13f. (vs. *ta-na-ak-[ki]-ir* "you

are hostile" 4:54:3f.; *lu-tam-ma-a-mi* "I will adjure (here?)"

3:7f.:14f. (vs. *li-it-ma-a-mi* "let him swear" ibid.:20f.).[157]

One troublesome form is *ut-ta-ah-hi-ir-mi*[158] "(the silver)

is in arrears" 5:94:11; it is probably a D perf. The wri-

ting *utt-* rather than the expected *ūt-* is difficult to ex-

plain; perhaps it is due to Hittite Akk. influence.[159]

---

[156]The Gtn is probably the only one of the iterative
(*-tan-*) conjugations that occurs; but see below, under Š.

[157]Note that the only D's of verbs that are active-
transitive in the G are *tummû* and *mullû*. The latter is used
only with the restricted meaning "to pay in full" (cf. CAD
M/2, 181ff.), and so only takes one direct object. In the
only occurrence of *tummû*, the second object ("make someone
swear *something*) has been deleted (cf. AHw, 1318a - *tamû* D 4).

[158]Cf. AHw, 18a (*ahāru*, D 2); note also CAD A/1, 170b.

[159]Cf. Labat, *AkkBo*, 11; Durham "BoAkk," 381. It seems
unlikely that *UD* has the value *u₄* here, since the value is
attested nowhere else in K. However, AHw, 18b (*ahāru*, D 3),

Another problem is the form *na-at-ta-kir-mi* in the fol-
lowing: *šumma arda amta ša RN nattak(k)ir-mi u šumma ana
amīli šanīm-ma ana šīmi nattadin-mi ū nattak(k)ir-mi* 4:
163:24'f., cf. 28'f. Nougayrol translates the form in
question: "nous n'avons pas distrait," but this is rather
vague. When *nakāru* takes an acc., it means "to dispute
something" or "to dispute with someone."[160] This is not
the meaning here; the previous lines tell us that RN₁ must
gather and return to RN₂ whatever servants of RN₂ live in
the other's country; and the men of RN₁'s country must
swear the above oath. Perhaps *nattak(k)ir* has a meaning
for which the D is used elsewhere: "to take someone to
another place."[161] We could then translate: "We have not
taken away (i.e., kidnapped) a male or female servant of
RN, nor have we sold or taken away (a servant of RN) to
anyone else." It is impossible to determine whether the
form is a G perf. (*nattakir*), wrongly used with a D meaning,
or a D perf. (*nattakkir*), with an incorrect prefix vowel.

In the Š, note, e.g., *ú-še-ēl-lu-ú* "(if) they produce
(bring up)" 4:163:30' (vs. *lā e-el-li* "she may not go up"
*AnOr*48:12:13); *ul-te-ši-ib-ši* "I made her dwell" *AnOr*48:
12:12 (vs. *ul aš-bu* "are not residing" 3:3:7, etc. with

lists OB *u₄-hu-ru*.

[160]Cf. *AHw*, 719a, (*nakāru* G 6 c,d).

[161]*AHw*, 719b, (*nakāru* D 6).

verbs of motion.[162]   The only difficulty is *tu-ul-te-el-li-*
šu-nu-ti in 4:122:11; if the form is a Š perf., as is most
likely, then the double *-ll-* is incorrect (*tultēli* is ex-
pected).   It is possible, however, that it is Štn pret.,
in which case the problem disappears.[163]

For the use of the N, note: *šumma amīlu...id-da-a-ak*
"if a man is killed" 4:153:4ff.[164] (vs. *šumma ša i-du-ku-šu*
iṣabbatū "if they catch the one(s) who killed him" ibid.:7f.
Note also [*adi(?) nukurtu...*] *ig-gám-mar* "until(?) the war
...is finished" 4:151:6.[165]   An N perf. occurs in *it-ta-ah-*
na-a[q][166] "he hanged himself/was hanged" *5:109:11.   A
possible N form, but one which, unlike all other N's attes-
ted, does not seem to differ in meaning from the G, occurs
in: *ana panī RN ana dīni na-aš-ša-ni-iq* "We went for a

_____

[162]E.g., *elū* 4:122:11; 4:159:28; 4:163:30; 4:169:20;
erēbu 4:209:6. Other Š's are verbs of condition: e.g.,
ešēru 4:192:15; *šanū* 4:157:49. The only Š of a verb that
is already transitive in the G is *šūbulu* (4:194:8,11) which
in the texts from Ras Shamra (and indeed probably in all
WPA) means simply "to send," and does not take a double ob-
ject, the first object (the person "caused to carry") al-
ways being deleted; cf. *CAD* A/1, 24ff. (*abālu* A, mng. 10).

[163]Cf. *GAG*, p. 44*, paradigm 34a. If the form is in
fact Štn, the other two verbs in the sequences of clauses
in 4:121f.:7ff. (*ti-it-ta-din-ma, tal-ta-kān*[an]) would be
Gtn pret., rather than G perf. The Gtn (and, presumably,
the Štn) sometimes has a distributive force (*GAG* §91f.),
and there are two persons involved as objects here.

[164]Other N's of *dâku* probably occur in 4:155f.:8,29;
see below, p. 131, n. 368.

[165]The N of *ṣabātu* probably occurs in 4:154:11; see
above, 46f.

[166]An Ntn pret. here seems unlikely.

legal case before RN" 4:176:7. If the verb is an N pret.,
it is the only occurrence of *s/šanāqu* in the N in the en-
tire corpus; it is also the only 1p example. The G, on
the other hand, occurs in the third person *p.* in the legal
texts, including the present one: *sākinu u PN ana dīni*
iš-ni-qu ibid.:2. Perhaps the form should be emended to
na-aš-<<ša->>ni-iq, a correct G pret.[167]

There are no certain examples of the *t* (reciprocal)
conjugations in K. However, note: *PN u amīlū GN ina birī-*
šunu im-tág-ru "PN and the men of GN agreed among themselves".
4:172:9f. Here the verb is probably Gt pret., rather than
G perf.[168]

e. Weak Verbs.

Almost all weak verbs are formed correctly, in typical
MB fashion. A few examples of the various types follow.

i. *verbs I-'*$_{1-2}$

Examples of the G are:

dur.: *i-mar* 4:192:10; perf.: *i-ta-bá-ak-ši* AnOr48:
11:8, cf. *l.*11; stative: *a-ri-ik* 4:194:13.

The only form that is not a G is the problematic D
pret. *ut-ta-ah-hi-ir-mi* 5:94:11 (see above, p. 64). All

---

[167]I.e., correct, given that the prefix of 1p verbs
in the legal texts is regularly *na-*; see above, p. 53.
AHw, 1021b (*sanāqu* I B G 3), lists the form, without emen-
dation, as G.

[168]The form is listed as Gt in *AHw*, 576a.

the attested forms may be Bab. or Ass., assuming that i and e are not distinct in K (see above, 24ff.).

The forms of the irregular verb *alāku* that are attested are all G or Gtn:

    G: dur.: *il-la-ka* 4:193:8; cf. 4:192:8; *5:109:r12';

        il-la-ku 4:151:8; cf. 3:7:21; 4:156:21,37; 4:158:

        7,14; perf.: *it-⌈ta⌉-[l]ak* 3:4a:9; *it-tal-ku-mi*

        4:174:5'; imper.: *a-lik* 5:103:r6'

    Gtn: dur.: *it-ta-na-la-ku-ni[m]-ma-a-mi* 4:162:15'.

It is possible that the G perf. forms listed above are Gt pret.'s; the context is not decisive in either case.

ii. *verbs I-'*$_{3-5}$

It was suggested in the phonology section (above, 24ff.), that there is no difference between i and e in K. On the basis of this, G forms which are Bab. are: dur.: *e-ep-pu-uš* 4:55:18; *e-ep-pûš-mi* 4:163:35'; perf.: ⌈*te*⌉*-te-pu-uš* *5:109:13; cf. *5:90:11. Ass. forms are: dur.: *e-pa-aš* 4:192:16; perf.: *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *e-tap-šu-mi* ibid.:8. All other forms may be either Bab. or Ass.; e.g.:

        dur.: *i-ir-ru-bu* 4:54:12; *e-er-ri-šu* ibid.:13;

        perf.: *e-te-li* (3f?s; Bab. *īteli*, Ass. *ētili*) 4:

        4:166:5,7.

The Gtn dur. *te-te-né-pûš-šu* (2ms) 4:193:12,24, is a Bab. form (Ass. *tētanappaš*).

In the š, all the forms are both Bab. and Ass.; e.g.:

> dur.: *ú-še-êl-lu-ú* 4:163:30'; pret.: *ú-še-li* 4:
> 170:9; perf.: *ul-te-ri-ib* 4:209:6.[169]

The forms of *edû* "to know" are listed below, under

verbs I-*y*.

iii. *verbs II-'*[170]

All the examples are G:

> dur.: *i-le-'-e-šu* 4:166:13, and *p.* in legal texts;
> perf.: *il-te-e-šu* 4:178:5; imper.: *ša-al-ma*[171] 5:
> 95:38.

It is more likely that ' is lacking in the last two

forms (i.e., *iltêšu*, *šāl-ma*), than that it is present, but

not indicated; there is, however, no way to be certain.

Note that the first example is Bab. (Ass. *ila''e*); the

_____

[169]On *tu-ul-te-el-li-šu-nu-ti* in 4:122:11, see p. 66, and n. 163.

[170]Verbs II-' in MB are discussed in Aro, *SMbG*, 74ff.

[171]The context is: *in[a]nna di-ni-šu ša-al-ma mullâ kî ša GN lu(-)ú-al-li-ni-šu*. The form of the last word remains difficult (see Nougayrol's n. 3); however, the second clause means: "they must pay the fine according to (the custom of) GN." Nougayrol takes the first verb from *šalāmu*, and translates: "maintenant son affaire est réglée." However, whether the verb were taken as f. pl. or m. sg. (with ventive), *dîntšu* would be in the wrong case. Moreover, in forms of *šalāmu* the closed syllable *šal* is always written with the SAL sign in K: e.g., *šal-ma-at*, *li-šal-li-im-šu* in the same text, *ll.26,34*. It is therefore preferable to take *ša-al-ma* as an imper. (plus -*ma*) of *ša'ālu*, and translate: "now, inquire about his case(s), so that they pay..." The sense also seems improved by this interpretation. *dîntšu* is thus acc. pl.; cf. above, p. 49, n. 106. (Note *ša-al-ma* "ask" also in *PRU* 3:11:13, a text of unknown origin.) A.F. Rainey *IOS* 5, 24, also takes the form from *ša'ālu*.

other two may be either.

iv. *verbs I-w*

In the G, the only prefix-conjugation form is the dur.
uṣ-ṣú-ma-a-mi (3mp) 4:162:18'. Otherwise, only *(w)ašābu*
is attested: stative: *a-ši-ib* (3ms) 6:37:10;[172] *aš-bu* (3mp)
3:3f.:7,11; 4:163:22'26'; infin.: *a-ša-bi* 4:193:8. No
forms with the original *w* occur.[173]

One D form occurs; the intervocalic *w* is written *m*:[174]
ú-maš-ša-ru-ka (dur.; 3ms) *5:109:10.

The following Š forms are attested:

  perf.: *ul-te-ši-ib-ši* AnOr48:12:12; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku*
  4:194:8; imper.: *šu-bi-la* ibid.:11.

Thus, the Š in K, as in U (see below, 255), exhibits *e*-
type forms.[175]

In all cases in which there is a distinction between
MB and MA forms, the I-*w* verbs are MB: *ašib, ašbū, ašābi,*
umaššarūka, šūbila (vs. MA *ušib, ušbū, ušābi, ušṣer, šēbila*).

---

[172]Cf. also **4:197:17.

[173]Cf. *GAG* §21c. In U, one such form is attested (*5:
137:7); see below, p. 256.

[174]Cf. *GAG* §21d.

[175]I.e., *ušēšib*, rather than *ušašib* or *ušūšib*; this
appears to be the case for the most part in MB and in Ass.
For the former, see Aro, *Glossar*, 5ff., s.v. *(w)abālu,*
(w)arādu, (w)aṣû, (w)ašābu; cf. also *GAG* §103v, where it
is noted that *šūšubu* is an *a*-type in OB, but an *e*-type in
MB and later (and in OAkk). For Ass., see Hecker, *GKT* §93g,
pp. 157f.; Mayer, *UGMa*, 76f.; also *GAG* §103w.

v. *verbs I-y*

The only G verb is *edû*, which occurs only in the pret. ("preformative stative"), and is always written with *i* in the prefix: *ti-i-de₄-šu* (2ms) 4:193:18; *ni-de₄-mi* (1p) 5: 95:50; cf. *ni-de-mì* 4:156:23.

One Š form is attested: *šu-ši-ir* (imper., ms) 4:192: 15. The form is Bab. (vs. Ass. *šēšer*).

vi. *verbs II-w*

All the attested forms are:

G: dur.: *i-ta-a-ar* (3ms) 4:55:19; pret.: *i-tu-ur* 4: *4:189:20; *i-tù-ra*[176] ibid.:19; *i-du-ku* (3mp) 5: 95:42; cf. 4:170:6; 4:153:7,13(3ms, subjn); perf.: *id-du₄-ku-šu* (3mp) 5:95:49; *ni-id-du₄-ku* (1p, subjn) ibid.:48; stative: *di-ì-ku* (3ms, subjn) 4: 170:21, cf. *l*.9; 4:173:6'; 4:172:5(3mp); *ze-e-zu* (3mp) 4:122:27.

D: dur.: *ù-ta-ar-ši* (3ms) AnOr48:12:17,20; *ù-ta-a-ar-ra-šu-nu-ti*[177] 4:55:15; *ù-ka-[a]l-lu* (3fs, subjn); perf.: *ut-te-er* (3ms) 4:209:14; cf. 4:208:5; AnOr 48:11:9; *ut-te-er-ru* (3mp) 4:173:11; imper.: *te-er-ra-šu-nu-ti-mi* 4:168:6; prec.: *li-te-er-mi* 4:163: 23',27'.

N: dur.: *id-da-a-ak* (3ms) 4:153f.:6,22; probably also

---

[176]On the pret. forms, see above, pp. 57f.

[177]On the extra vowel-sign, see above, p. 24.

i-du-ku-$m\bar{\imath}$ and i-da-ku (both 3mp) 4:155f.:8,29.[178]

All of the forms that show a difference vis-à-vis Bab. and Ass. in the above are Bab.: $it\^ar$, $utt\bar{e}r$, $utterr\bar{u}$, $terra\check{s}\check{s}un\bar{u}t\bar{\imath}$-$mi$, $lit\bar{e}r$-mi, and probably $idd\^ak$ (vs. Ass. $it\bar{u}ar$, $utta$''$ir(\bar{u})$, ta''era-, $lita$''er, $*idd\bar{u}ak$.[179]

vii. *verbs II-y*

The following are all the attested forms; all are G:

pret.: i-ri-ib "he replaced(?)" 6:37:6;[180] perf.:

ir-te-eh (3ms) 5:95:17; $[i]r$-ti-ih 4:166:9;

ir-ti-hu (3fp) 4:208:11.

viii. *verbs third weak*

The majority of these verbs require little comment. The final vowel alway assimilates to a following vocalic suffix,[181] resulting in an ultra-long vowel, which is usually written CV_1-V_1, except when an additional ending follows.[182] As examples, note: G: iq-bi (pret.; 3ms) 4:162:16', but iq-bu-$\acute{u}$ (3mp) ibid.:13', and i-qa-ab-bu-ni (dur.;

---

[178]These forms are discussed below, p. 131, n. 368.

[179]Not attested, but likely; cf. *GAG*, p. 35*, paradigm 28, n. 24.

[180]This form occurs in a badly broken context. See A. F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 38.

[181]This is a distinctly Bab. feature; in Ass., the vowels generally remain uncontracted (*GAG* §16; cf. §105). Other examples of vowel contraction in K are cited above, p. 26.

[182]Exceptions occur in both conditions, however: e.g., ih-ta-$t\acute{u}$ ($ihta\underline{t}\bar{u}$; G perf., 3mp) 4:121:6; it-ma-a-mi 4:166:4,6.

ventive) 4:155:11; similarly the following D dur. forms:
û-ma-al-la (3ms) 4:153f.:9,12, but *û-ma-al-lu-û* (3mp) ibid.:
14,19, and *û-ma-al-lu-ni* (ventive) 4:156:35.

The final vowel of the stative 3ms of *zakû* varies in
the two examples encountered: *za-ki* *4:189:26, but *za-a-ku*
6:36:16.[183] One form of *tamû* appears to have a final *-i*,
rather than the *-a* attested elsewhere: *it-t[a-m]i* (perf.;
3ms) 3:8:22,[184] but *it-ta-ma* 4:170:16; *i-tam-ma* (dur.) 4:
177:23; *it-ma-a-mi* (pret.) 4:166:4,6.

Finally, it should be noted that the dur. of verbs
III-*e* regularly has *e* between the first two radicals;[185]
all the forms encountered are G: *i-ger-re* (3ms) AnOr48:12:
23; *i-le-ʾ-e-šu* 4:166:12, and p.; ⌈*i-le*⌉-*eq-qú-u* (3mp) 4:
54:10.[186]

5. *Prepositions*

a. Simple Prepositions.

adi: does not occur in K as a preposition.

---

[183]Cf. *GAG* §105d,f. The alternation seems to be
typical of this verb; cf. *CAD* Z, 25ff. In U, *zaki* predo-
minates; *zakāʾ* is also found, but not *zaku*; see below, 235.

[184]The copy of this text, in *Mélanges...Dussaud* (op.
cit., p. 1, n. 2, above) is very bad; the sign in question
looks like ⌈*mì*⌉, but Nougayrol read [m]i(?). The form *li-
it-mi-ma* 4:170:12, is most likely a scribal error, namely,
a metathesis of the last two signs; cf., in the same text,
it-ta-mq l.16; note also *li-it-ma-mi* 4:172:6.

[185]This is also a typically Bab. feature (vowel har-
mony); cf. *GAG* §105f. In U, forms with *a* (e.g., *ilaqqe*)
occur at least as often as forms with *e*; see below, 181ff.

[186]Cf. also *i-le-eq-qe* (3ms) **4:196:11.

am-minî "why?": perhaps in *5:90:11; see below under *kîkî*.

ana "to,for": always written *a-na*. It is attested with most of its normal Akk. nuances: e.g., dative: *ana PN it-tadin* "he gave to PN" 4:178:9; *ana PN umtallû* "they paid to PN" 5:95:54; and *p*.; in expressions of price:[187] *ana 200 kaspi iptaṭaršu* "he ransomed him for 200 silver" 4:165:7; cf. 3:7:9f.; *ana šîmi* "for a price" 4:163:25',29'; with infinitives: e.g., *ana tummî* "to swear" 4:167:18. It is quite rare, however, for motion toward something, or for direction; usually *ana muhhi* is used; but cf. *māru ana māri lā itūr* "son may not return (in court) against son" *4:189:20. See also *ana muhhi* and *ana panî* below.

arki "behind": written EGIR and EGIR-*ki*. It occurs alone only once: E[GI]R *tuppi annî* "after this tablet (is completed)" 4:163:30'; several times with *ina*, in the expression *ina arki ūmî* "forever (lit.: after the days)" e.g., 4:169:18.

aššum: once written *áš-šúm* (5:103:5); otherwise always *aš-šum*. It occurs with the meaning "concerning," often in the (elliptical[188]) expression *aššum dīni...ša tašpura* "concerning the case...about which you wrote" e.g., 5:95:5ff.,

_____

[187]In U, *ina* is normally used for this purpose; see below, p. 265.

[188]See below, pp. 159f.

and often. It is also found with the verbs *ragāmu* "to con-
test" (p., e.g., 4:173:14ff.) and *tamû* "to swear" (4:155:
15f.), and the expressions *dīna gerû* "start a lawsuit" (*An
Or*48:12:21ff.) and *ana māmīti nadānu* "to impose an oath"
4:167:10ff.

biri: see the compound prepositions, below, s.v.

eli: does not occur.

ina: always written *i-na*, has a broad range of uses: e.g.,
locative: *ina GN litmû* "let them swear in GN" 5:15:43f.; *ina
bit kīli kalī-mi* "was held in a prison" *5:108:6f.; com-
pleted motion to a place: *ina GN tultellīšunūti* "she sent
them over to GN" 4:122:10f.; *ina ekalli...lā elli* "she
not go up into the palace" *AnOr*48:11f.:13f.; *ina GN uttēršī*
"he sent her back to GN" ibid.:9; also with *erēbu*, in con-
trast to normal Akk. usage (with *ana*):[189] [ša] *ina mātīšu
...irrubū* "who enter his land" 4:54:11f.; cf. also 4:209:
5f.; temporal (time "when"): *ina šērti umaššarūka* "in the
morning they will release you" *5:109:9f.; instrument: *ina
emū[qi]* "by force" 6:36:5; cf. *ina māmīti itammû* "they
will swear by an oath" 4:156f.:22,40. In several of these
functions, *ina* is augmented by *libbi* (q.v.); cf. also *(ina)
arki, ina biri, ina pānī*. *ina* seems often to be replaced
by *ištu* (q.v.).

---

[189]*AHw*, 234b (*erēbu*, G 1).

ištu: always *iš-tu* (never *ultu*). This preposition has a
very broad semantic range in K. It often, of course, de-
notes motion "away from": e.g., *ištu māmīti nahāsu/tāru*
"to shrink/turn away from (taking) an oath" (e.g., 4:162:
5'f.; 4:173:11); or "out of": e.g., *ištu mātīni uṣṣû-mā-mi*
"they go out of our country" 4:162:18'. It is used tempo-
rally once: *tuppu annû ištu ša ababi šarri kanik* "This
tablet was sealed since (the time of) the king's grand-
father" 4:55:20f.[190] But other phrases with *ištu* are not
common in regular Akk. In one text, e.g., it occurs where
kī is expected: *ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tēteneppuššu*
"treat him well, according to his rank."[191] Very often,
ištu appears to replace an expected *ina*; thus, note: *PN₁*
PN₂ ištu dīni iltēšu "PN₁ defeated PN₂ in court" 4:178:4f.,[192]
for normal Akk. *PN ina dīni leʾû*.[193] Instead of **ina X*
qāt PN īteli, there occurs *PN ištu X kaspi qātšu ēteli* "PN

---

[190]This seems more likely than that *ištu* expresses the
agent ("by the king's grandfather"), as Nougayrol takes it.
The use of *ša* here with *ištu* is unique in K.

[191]Nougayrol has: "tache de lui procurer de bonne
façon ce qui lui revient"; *CAD* Z, 148a (*zittu* 7) renders:
"according to what is due to him." This seems to be a
unique meaning of *zittu* as well. It is possible, though
unlikely, that *ištu* here is the (usually) Ass. preposition
(*išti*) meaning "with," but this range of meaning too does
not seem to include the one necessary here; cf. *AHw*, 401;
CAD I/J, 283.

[192]Cf. perhaps also 4:174:9'.

[193]Cf. the examples in *CAD* L, 155b (*leʾû* 2a), and this
U passage: *u iltê PN...ina dīni ana pī šībūtīšu* "and PN...
won the case on the testimony of his witnesses" 3:72a:7f.

forfeited X silver" 4:166:5, cf. 7.[194] There is also the

following: *šarrat GN zittašunu ištu kaspi hurāṣi ištu unū-*

tēšunu ištu gabba mimmûšunu tittadin-ma "The queen of GN

provided their inheritance out of the silver (and) gold,

and out of their vessels, out of all their property" 4:121:

7ff.; cf. also *4:189:26ff. Again, in these sentences, *ina*

is expected.[195] Finally, note: *PN ištu damī...zaku* "PN is

free of blood(-claims)..." 6:37:15ff., whereas native Akk.

uses *ina* when what one is "free" of is specified (although

this is rare).[196] Cf. also *ištu (lēt),* below under *lētu.*

It is possible that in at least some of these expressions,

the abnormal occurrence of *ištu* reflects a word in a sub-

strate dialect, which it normally translated.[197]

itti "with": always *it-ti,* expresses accompaniment, of per-

sons (cf. *qadu,* below): e.g., *ittīya ul ašbū* "they are not

living with me" 3:3:6f.; *unūte ša ittīšu ihalliqū* "the

utensils that might be lost with him" 4:153f.:10f., 15f.;

---

[194]For native Akk., cf. the examples in *CAD* E, 125a
(*elû* 3 b 3'). For this expression in K, see above, 45f.

[195]Cf. *AHw,* 380b (*ina* II 1 c); *GAG* §114c.

[196]There are very few examples of this in *CAD* Z, but
cf. pp. 27a and 29b (*zakû* 2b and 5a 1'). In OA, *zakû* is
often construed with *išti* "with (respect to)" plus the per-
son who has a claim (cf. *CAD* Z 28 – *zakû* 3), but it is
doubful that that idiom influenced the one found here.

[197]Perhaps WS *min,* which would likely be used in most
of the expressions above (cf. Joüon, *GHB* §133e, p. 406;
§170i, p. 623), or, more likely, a preposition which covered
the range of both *ina* and *ištu,* such as Ugaritic *b;* see
below, p. 266, and n. 395.

šumma RN itti FN...idabbub "if RN speaks with FN..." *AnOr*
48:12:17ff. In 4:121:4ff., it must be translated "against":
PN₁ u PN₂ itti RN...hīṭata ihtaṭû "PN$_1$ and PN$_2$ committed a
crime against RN..." Similarly, it is used with *nakāru* "to
be hostile or at war with/ against" in 4:54f.:1f.,3f.,16f.
In *X itti Y ana dīni išniqū* "X and Y came to court," *itti*
replaces the conjunction *u*, the verb remaining in the pl.:
4:166:2f.; 4:168:2ff.; 6:36:2f.; 6:37:2f.; with *u*, cf. 4:176:
2; etc. Finally, note the adverbial expression *itti ahāmiš*
"together (lit.: with each other)" in 4:151:13.

kī "like, as": written *ki-i*, occurs only three times: *kī*
šarrāqi mullâ umalla "Like a thief, he will pay a fine" 4:
163:31'; [ša] *ina mātīšu kī munnabtūti irrubū* "who enter
his land as fugitives" 4:54:10f.; once, with *ša*:[198] *mullâ*
kī ša GN lu(-)u-al-li-ni-šu[199] "They will pay a fine accor-
ding to (the custom of) GN" 5:95:38f. Note that *kī* also
occurs with and without *ša* as a conjunction; see below,

kīma and *kīmê*: do not occur as prepositions.

kīmū: only in: *7 napšāti...ki-i-mu-û bīt PN₁ bīt PN₂ u*
ki-i-mu-û bīt PN₃ ana PN₄ ittadin "he gave PN$_4$ seven per-
sons...in exchange for the estates of PN$_1$, PN$_2$, and PN$_3$"
4:168:8ff.

----

[198]Cf. *CAD* K, 324f. (*kī* c).

[199]The verb form remains obscure; cf. *Ug.* 5, 95, n.3.

libbi (4:163:26'): see the compound prepositions, below.

qadu "together with": always *qa-du*, used four times with
persons, with the verb *tamû*: *PN qadu šībūtīšu litmā-mi*
"Let PN together with (or: and) his witnesses swear" 5:95:
28f.,32f.; cf. 4:159:22f.,28f. Twice in one text, it oc-
curs with inanimate objects: *bīt PN qadu maškanīšu kirîšu
...u qadu gabbi mimmûšu* "PN's estate, with its threshing floor,
its orchard, with and with (its) everything" 4:167:14ff.

b. Compound Prepositions.

Here are listed the most common compound prepositions,
i.e., idiomatic expressions composed of a simple preposi-
tion and a noun in the bound form. They are listed alpha-
betically, first by the noun, then by the preposition.
biri "between": after *ina*: *PN u amīlū GN ina bi-ri-šu-nu
imtagrū* "PN and the men of GN agreed among themselves" 4:
172:9f.; *māmīta ina be-ri-šu-nu taltakan* "she imposed an
oath between them" 4:122:12f. In the only other passage,
biri is repeated, but *ina* is deleted in the second instance;
also, *ša* is used: *rikilta ina be-ri ša GN₁ u be-ri ša GN₂
akanna irkus* "He made a treaty between GN$_1$ and GN$_2$ as fol-
lows" 4:154f.:4f.

lētu: occurs once, with *ištu*: *šar GN ištu le-et PN...
iptaṭaršu* "the king of GN ransomed him from PN..." 4:165:
5ff. In a similar sentence, *ištu* alone occurs: *PN ištu
sutî...iptaṭaršu* "PN ransomed him from the Suteans..." 3:

7:8ff. In both cases, *ištu* is probably for normal Akk. *ina*; see above, and note, e.g., the following MB example: *uṭṭeta ina le-et PN muhur* "accept wheat from PN," cited in Aro, *SMbG*, 108f.[200]

libbu: *ina libbi* (usually *i-na* ŠÀ; but *i-na* ŠÀ-*bi* in 4:155f.:7,29; 4:168:9; not found in the letters) is usually a synonym of *ina*, with locative meaning: e.g., *ina libbi bīt kīli iltakanšu-mi u ina libbi bīt* ⌈*kīl*⌉*i imūt-mi* "he put him in prison, and he died in prison" 6:36:6f., but *ina bīt kīli kalī-mi* "he was held in prison" *5:108:7; *ina libbi GN ihtanabbatū-mi* "they keep making incursions into GN" 4:162f.:19', cf. 15', but *ša ina GN ihtanabbatū* ibid.: 20. In one instance, *ina* is deleted after *ša*:[201] *mīnum-mê ardī...ša libbi GN ašbū* "whatever servants...live in GN" 4:163:26'; but cf. *mīnum-mê ardī...ina GN ašbū-mi* ibid.:21f. On other occasions it is likely that *ina libbi* is used rather than simply *ina* to emphasize the locative notion: e.g., *šumma amīl GN ina libbi GN iddâk* "if a man is killed within (the borders of) GN" 4:153f.:20ff.; cf. 4ff.; 4:155f.: 7ff.,29f.; 4:127:9f. Once, the expression denotes inclusion: *7 napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīlī 4 sinnišāti* "seven persons, among them three men (and) four women" 4:168:8f.

---

[200]*ištu lēt* meaning "from (a person)" occurs elsewhere in the Ras Shamra texts: e.g., *Ug.* 5:118:15f. (from Qadesh); *PRU* 4:224:19f. (probably from Khatti); *Ug.* 5:132:7' (origin unknown). *lētu* is not attested in U, however.

[201]Cf. *GAG* §115c.

The above are all the attestations of the phrase.

muhhu: *ana muhhi* (once *a-na* UGU 4:194:5; otherwise always
a-na muh-hi) is used very often to denote motion toward or
against someone, in several idioms: (a) frequently in the
expression *lū sulmu ana muhhīka* "well-being be to you" in
the introduction of all the letters except *5:90f.; (b) in
X kaspa (mullâ) ana muhhi Y šakānu "to fine someone (Y) X
silver," e.g., *šarru 140 šiqil kaspa mullâ ana muhhi PN
iltakan* "the king fined PN 140 shekels of silver" 4:178:
6ff.; cf. 4:176:9f.; 4:179:9f. 5:94:12ff.; with the same
verb, note: *narkabāti [ša an]a muhhīka...iltaknū* "the cha-
riots which were placed in your charge..." 4:192:11ff. (c)
related to these is *400 kaspu ana muhhi PN₁ u ana muhhi
PN₂ [an]ā[k]u(?) hubbul-mi* "400 silver is owed to me(?) by
(or: charged...against) PN$_1$ and PN$_2$" 5:94:8ff.; cf. *800
kaspu...ša ana muhhīya* "the 800 silver...which was owed
by me" ibid. 18ff.; (d) with *rāhu*: *600 kaspu ana muhhīšu
irtēh-mi* "600 silver remains (owing) by him" ibid.:16f.;[202]
(e) also in the very common expression *ana muhhi PN ragāmu*

[202]In one instance, it is probable that *ana* has been
deleted after *ša* (cf. GAG §115c,h): *kaspu [š]a muhhīšu
uttahhir-mi danniš* "the silver owed by him is greatly in
arrears" 5:94:10f. Nougayrol restores [an]a rather than
[š]a at the beginning of *l*.11. Without the relative pro-
noun, however, the sentence would probably mean "the silver
is greatly in arrears against him," which makes less sense
in the context. What is visible after the break is ▨▨▨,
which could be the end of either *NA* or *ŠA*. Cf. also the
omission of *ina* after *ša* in 4:163:26', quoted above, under
libbu.

"to contest (a case) against someone," e.g., 4:166:10, and

p.; (f) once with a verb of motion: *ana muhhi* [*šam*]*ši*

alik "go to the Sun" 5:103:r5'f.[203]

panū: occurs with *ana* (always *a-na pa-ni*), meaning "in

the presence of, before": e.g., *ana panī ·RN sākinu u PN*

ana dīni išniqū "The prefect and PN came to court in the

presence of RN" 4:176:1f., and *p.* at the head of legal

texts;[204] *ana panī DN māmīta ina berīšunu taltakan* "She

imposed an oath between them before DN" 4:122:12f.; cf.

ana panī ahhī...itammûni "they will swear in the presence

of the brothers..." 4:157:39f.[205]

qātu: occurs only once in a prepositional expression, in

a text whose K origin is not absolutely certain:[206] *zaki*

PN₁ u PN₂...ištu ŠU PN₃ "PN$_1$ and PN$_2$...are free (of claims)

from PN$_3$" *4:189:26ff.

6. *Adverbs*

The following alphabetical list contains all the ad-

verbs or words used adverbially that occur.

adīni "until now": probably once in a broken context in

---

[203]Cf. also *amīl(a)ya ana muhhi mārīya ·aṭrussu* [*u*] "I
sent my man to to my son" **4:196:8f.

[204]Cf. also 4:162:18' (with *qabû* "speak"); 4:179:7
(with *tarāṣu* "make confirmation").

[205]In **4:197:12f., *ina panī* occurs: *mamma ina panīšu
lū lā iparrik* "No one must stand in his way."

[206]This perhaps casts further doubt on the origin of
this text. See above, p. 19.

*5:91:12:   ] ⌈a⌉-di-ni⌈.²⁰⁷

ahāmiš "each other, together": only once, preceded by *itti*:
itti a-ha-miš isal⌊lamū⌋ "(when) they are at peace with
each other" 4:151:13.

akanna "thus": always *a-kán-na*, very frequently with verbs
involving speaking (e.g., *qabû* "speak," *tamû* "swear," *parāsu*
"render a decision"), with reference to the quote (or oath,
or decision) that follows: e.g., *PN akanna iqbi mā* "PN
spoke as follows: (quote)" 4:179a:3f., and *p*. It can also
refer to an action or quantity mentioned previously: e.g.,
inanna atta aka⌊nna⌋ tētepuš "Now, you have acted in this
way" *5:109:12f., referring to *ll*.6ff.; *kī maṣ̂mê n⌊arka⌋bāt
šamšu iqtab⌊û⌋ akanna šūbi⌊la⌋* "However many chariots the
Sun commanded, send that many" 5:103:6ff.; etc. Note also
mullâ akannā-ma "the fine is the same" 4:154:23.

anumma "now, hereby": always *a-nu-ma*, found only in the
letters; followed by (a) the dur.: e.g., *anumma PN...
illakakku* "Now, PN...is coming to you" 4:192:5ff.; cf. 3:
7:19ff.; *5:109:r11'f.; (b) the perf.: e.g., *anumma middata
mūraka u rupša ultēbilakku* "I hereby send you the measure-
ment, length and width" 4:194:6ff.; cf. 3:3f.:8f.; 4:188:
15ff.; (c) once by the pret.: *anumma ištu ekalli išpurū-*

---

²⁰⁷P.-R. Berger, in *UF* 2, 286, proposes ...*pa⌋-q-ṭi-ni*
"our borders," but this is unlikely; *pāṭu* is elsewhere in
K (eight times, including twice in this text) always writ-
ten with the logogram ZAG.

nikku "Now then, they wrote to you from the palace" 3:6:9f.

appūna "moreover": normally at the beginning of the sentence: *u ap-pu-na ina GN lā utārši* "Moreover, he will not return her to GN" *AnOr*48:12:14; but before the verb in ibid.:16: *ina ekalli ša šar GN ap-pu-na lā elli* "She may not go up, moreover, to the palace of the king." Elsewhere, the particle occurs twice with -*ma*: *ap-pu-na-ma šarru* ⌜*akan*⌝*na iqbi* "Moreover, the king spoke as follows" 4:163:21'; cf. 4:193:13.

arkānu "afterwards": only in *u EGIR-nu a*⌜*na dīni lā un*⌝*ammašūšu* "and afterwards he may not be taken to court" 4:161:15f.

ašrānu "there": only in *PN₁ aš-ra-nu itti PN₂ ašābi illaka* "PN₁ is coming there to live with PN₂" 4:193:6ff.

danniš "greatly": once, uniquely following the verb: *kaspu ...uttahhir-mi dan-nīš* "The silver...is greatly in arrears" 5:94:10f.

enūma: probably an adverb in K, meaning "now then" or the like; see below, pp. 140f.

gabbu: used adverbially in the acc., meaning "entirely," in 4:128:11, quoted above, pp. 41f.

inanna "now": frequently at the beginning of sentences,

as an interjection, "now then,"[208] e.g., 5:94f.:24,37,43.

Occasionally, it retains its original temporal sense: e.g.,

inanna RN šarru šanuttīšu iknuk "King RN has now sealed it

again" 4:55:22f. *inanna* is never preceded by *u*. The double

adverbial expression *inanna anumma* does not occur in K.

kâm-ma "thus": from *kīam-ma*, once, in the very difficult

clause *šumma amīlam(!?) mīta(?) ka-a-ma iṣabbatūni*[209] "if

they find(?) a dead man(??) in this way(?)" 4:155:19.

Note that MB has only *kīam*, and once *kâ*.[210]

kīkī "how?": proposed by Nougayrol in *5:90:11: [*ki-i-kī*]-*i*

akanna tētep[*uš*], which he translates: "[Comment d]onc as-

tu pu [agir] ainsi?" But [*am-mi-ni*]-*i* is just as likely:

"Why have you acted thus?"

lā "not": see below, pp. 110ff.

minsu "for what reason?": perhaps in *mi-in-s*[*û*(?)][211]...]

mārat šamši ramā[*nša i*]*štu qaqqarīš*[*a*...] *uttakkiraššī* "For

what reason has he removed the daughter of the Sun herself

from her ground?(?)" *5:109:13ff. However, it must be

---

pointed out that *minsu* is so far attested only in SB and NB.[212]

mithāriš: normally in Akk., this adverb means "to the same extent, all together."[213] In its sole occurrence in K, however, it means "likewise, as well": *šar GN 400 kaspa* [*šā*]*šu*[214] *mi-it-ha-ri-iš ana muhhi PN iltakan-mi* "The king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN as well" 5:94:12ff.

šanîta "moreover": not attested in K.

šanûti-[215] "for the second time": only in *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu iknuk* "he sealed it for the (lit.: its, referring to the tablet) second time" 4:44:23. The double *-tt-* is an Ass. feature.[216]

šēram: see *urram*, below.

ṭābiš "well": with *kî* in *kî* DU₁₀.GA-*iš lū tēteneppuššu* "treat him well" 4:193:11f.,23f.; cf. [*ki(?)*] DU₁₀.GA-*iš* [...*š*]*ukunšu* "Place him well..." *5:109:r13'f.[217]

    212*CAD* M/2, 89a.

    213Cf. *CAD* M/2, 132ff.

    214On this reading, see above, p. 35, n. 60.

    215Cf. *GAG* §71b, and *AHw*, 1167b, according to which this form is a MB/MA development.

    216*GAG* §20d.

    217Cf. also [*ki(?)*] DU₁₀.GA *dugulšu* "treat him well" **4:197:17f.

ul "not": see below, pp. 110ff.

umma "thus": see below, p. 91.

urram: only with *šēram* (always *ur-ra-am še-ra-am*) meaning
"in future," at the beginning of prohibitions in legal
texts: e.g., *urram šēram PN₁ ana muhhi PN₂ lā iraggum* "In
future, PN₁ may not contest against PN₂" 4:166:9ff.; also
in 4:128:12; 4:164:7; 4:167:20; 4:168:13; 6:37:17.

yānu: does not occur in K.[218]

yānum-ma "or else, conversely" (*AnOr*48:12:19,20): see
below, p. 128.

7. *The Enclitic Particle* -mê

The WPA enclitic particle *-mê* (written *me-e*)[219] occurs
on several forms in K. From the interrogative pronouns
mīnu(m) "what?" and *mannu(m)* "who?" (neither attested in K),
it forms the indefinite pronouns *mīnum-mê* "whatever" and
mannum-mê "whoever."[220] From the interrogative adverb *kī*

---

[218]In 4:164:10f., Nougayrol reads NU.TUK as *yānu*. How-
ever, *lā īšu* is a more likely reading of the logogram in the
context: *aššum bīt PN ša RN šar GN bēl dīnīšu* NU.TUK "con-
cerning PN's estate (now belonging) to RN king of GN, he
(i.e., the king) will have no adversary." Also, in a U
text, NU.TUK is glossed *la i-šu-ni₇* (3:102:15); and cf.
I/J, 289ff. In 5:95:49, *ia-nu-ma* is to be read *ayyānum-ma*
"anyone"; see above, pp. 40f.

[219]*AHw*, 639b.

[220]See above, pp. 37ff.

maṣi "how many?"[221] is derived the indefinite relative ad-

verb *kī maṣī-mê* "however many," which occurs twice: *aššum*

narkabāti ša tašpura ki-i ma-ṣi-me-e n[arkaba]t[222] šamšu

iqtab[û][223] *akanna šūbi[la]* "Concerning the chariots about

which you wrote: send however many chariots the Sun has

commanded" 5:103:5ff.;[224] *anumma PN...illakakku ṣābīka u*

narkabātī!ka immar ki-i ma-ṣi-me-e [ṣāb]ī narkabāti! [ša

an]a muhhīka ištu ekalli iltaknū šūšir "Now PN is coming

to see your troops and chariots. Make ready however many

troops (and) chariots were placed at your disposal from

the palace" 4:192:6ff.[225]

---

[221]Cf. *AHw*, 622a (*maṣû* G 6); *GAG* §120a α; *CAD* M/2,
346f. (*maṣû* 1 e ;').

[222]It is assumed here that *kī maṣī-mê* is not of itself
a relative pronoun or conjunction, and that a relative
clause must be introduced in some other way. This would of
course usually be *ša* (as is almost certainly to be restored
in the next example); since there is no *ša* in this passage,
the further assumption has been made that we are dealing
with a *bīt īpušu* construction. Thus, literally: "accor-
ding to (*kī*) whatever (*-mê*) sufficiency/amount (*maṣi*) of
chariots which (*narkabāt*) the Sun has commanded."

[223]All that is visible of Nougayrol's restored *-b[i]*,
and our proposed *-b[u-û]* is: ⟨sign⟩.

[224]This seems to make more sense than Nougayrol's
rendering: "Quant aux chars dont tu m'as mandé: 'Combien
de chars?' le Soleil a (simplement) di[t(?):] 'Envoie!' "

[225]Nougayrol translates from *ṣābīka* as follows: "Il
va voir à combien montent tes soldats et tes chars. (Donc,)
soldats et chars qui ont été mis à ta charge par le Palais
mets en route." One reason for rejecting this is that
clauses in K are almost without exception verb-final (see
below, p. 93); thus, *kī maṣī-mê* should go with *šūšir*
rather than *immar*. Furthermore, our interpretation affords
a closer parallel to the previous example. Finally, *-mê*
does not seem to form interrogatives, but rather always in-
definite pronouns.

$-m\hat{e}$ is also suffixed to $k\bar{\imath}$ to form $k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$,[226] which appears twice as a conjunction (but never as a preposition) in K, possibly differing in meaning from $k\bar{\imath}$.[227] Finally, $-m\hat{e}$ may in one instance be attached to $\check{s}umma$, with no apparent difference in meaning: $m\bar{a}$ $\check{s}umma$-$m\hat{e}$ $tamk\bar{a}r\bar{u}$ $\check{s}a$ $mandatti$ $\check{s}a$ $\check{s}ar$ GN_1 ina $libbi$ GN_2 $iddukk\bar{u}$-mi[228] "if traders with endowment capital[229] of the king of GN_1 are killed in GN_2" 4:154ff.:6f.; note the parallel clause in the second half of the text: u $\check{s}umma$ $tamk\bar{a}r\bar{u}$ $\check{s}a$ $\check{s}ar$ GN_2 $\check{s}a$ $mandatti$ ina $libbi$ GN_1 $iddakk\bar{u}$[228] $ll.28f.$ It is possible, however, that in the earlier clause, $-me$-e is a scribal error for $-mi$, the particle indicating direct speech (see the next section); note that the clause is introduced by $m\bar{a}$, and that $-mi$ is written with ME in this text. Thus, we would have $\check{s}um$-ma-$m\bar{\imath}$<<$-e$>>; as support for this possibility, note $m\bar{a}$ $\check{s}um$-ma-$m\bar{\imath}$ in the parallel text 4:158ff.:15,30.

8. *Markers of Direct Speech*

The enclitic particle $-mi$[230] is always written with MI in the letters and legal texts, and in 4:54f. (an edict).

---

[226]Cf. *AHw*, 478a.

[227]$k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$ occurs in 4:151:11; *5:109:8; on its meaning in K, see below, pp. 138f.

[228]For this normalization of i-du-ku-$m\bar{\imath}$ and i-da-ku, see below, p. 131, n. 368.

[229]For this meaning of $man/ddattu$, see *CAD* M/1, 15 (mng. 3).

[230]Cf. *GAG* §123c.

In the treaties 4:154ff. and 4:158ff., ME (*mĭ*) is used.
Phonologically, -*mi* has the effect on words to which it is
attached as -*ma*. Thus, the final *m* of the ventive is pre-
served: *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *id-nam-mi* 4:168:7; and
final vowels are lengthened: *it-ma-a-mi* 4:166:4,6; *ni-de₄-
e-mi* 4:163:20'; *uš-šú-ma-a-mi* 4:162:18'.

   -*mi* most often occurs in direct quotes, usually at-
tached to one word (normally the predicate) in each clause.[231]
Quotes are introduced by the particle *mā* (*ma-a*):[232] e.g.,
*PN itti šar GN...ana dīni išniqū mā ardūya šunū-mi u ina
tuppīya kanki šaṭrū-mi terraššunūtī-mi ū šumma pūhī ardīya
idnam-mi* "PN together with the king of GN went to court,
(saying): 'They are my servants, and are written on my tab-
let. Return them to me, or else give me substitutes for my
servants'" 4:168:2ff.[233]

   mā and the direct quote may follow verbs other than
those of speaking; other possibilities are: *parāsu* "to
decide" (e.g., 4:170:10), *ṣabātu* "to take hold of (for pay-
ment)" (e.g., *4:189:5), *mahāru* "to approach" (e.g., 4:162:
7'). Once, *mā* is repeated during a quote, perhaps to indi-
cate clearly that the following sentence is also part of

---

   [231]In some quotes containing several clauses, however,
-*mi* occurs only once or twice: e.g., in 4:54f.; 4:154ff.;
4:158ff.; 4:169ff.

   [232]*GAG* §121b lists this as an Ass. (M/NA) particle.

   [233]Similar examples occurs, e.g., in 3:7f.; 4:176f.;
5:94f.

the quotation: *mārū GN litmû mā šumma hapīrī ša dimta im-
haṣū ⌈nīdē-m⌉i mā šumma attūni hapīrū ša dimta šâšu imtah-
haṣū⌈ṣū-m⌉i* "Let the citizens of GN swear: 'We do not know
the Hapiru who struck down the tower; nor are the Hapiru
who kept striking down said tower ours' " 4:162:2'ff.

The particle *umma* (always written *um-ma*) occurs *p.* in
letter introductions in the expression *umma X-(ma)* "thus
(says) X." It also begins the royal edict 4:54f.: *umma
šarrim-ma* "Thus (says) the king." It is found only once
in the legal texts, where it announces a reply: *PN₁...PN₂
...iṣbat mā 300 kaspa habbulātā-mi umma PN₂...mā mimma lā
habbulāku-mi* "PN₁...seized PN₂...: 'You owe 300 silver';
thus PN₂...: 'I owe nothing' " *4:189:2ff.

On the case of the noun after *umma*, see above, p. 46.

9. *Assyrian Forms*

The number of certain Assyrianisms is quite small.
They are:

(i) the *a*-vowel in the following verbs: *e-pa-aš* 4:
192:16; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *e-tap-šu-mi* ibid.:8; *ha-
bu-la-tá/ku-mi* *4:189:6,8;

(ii) the double *-tt-* in the abstract ending of two
words (Bab. *-ūt*): *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu* 4:55:23; *ÌR-ut-ti* 4:165:
8;[234]

---

[234]It should be pointed out that there are other, unex-
plained, consonant doublings in K (see above, p. 23). It
is possible that the forms with *-tt-* are simply two more
examples, rather than Assyrianisms.

    (iii) the 3ms independent pronoun *šu-ú-ut*, in 4:164:14; 4:193:20,21;

    (iv) the 3mp acc. suffix *-šunu*, in 3:8:26.

    There are several other possible Assyrianisms in the corpus:

    (v) other verb and noun forms with *e* for expected Bab. *i*; but these probably merely indicate a lack of contrast between the two vowels in K; see above, pp. 24f.;

    (vi) the 3fs verbs with prefix *t-* in 4:122:10,11,13; but these could be due to WS influence; the forms are cited above, p. 52;

    (vii) the preposition *ištu*, meaning "with, according to" in 4:193:10,22 (above, p. 76);

    (viii) the particle *mā*, indicating direct speech follows; see above, p. 90.

    (ix) the possibly subjunctive form *ni-id-du₄-ku* in an oath in 5:95:48; see above, p. 61.

    (x) the use of *-ma* in the royal genealogies in legal texts; see below, pp. 115f.

    (xi) the use of *lū* before *lā* in prohibitions; see below, p. 111, and n. 303.

D. SYNTAX

1. *Word Order*[235]

a. Verbal Clauses.[236]

These exhibit remarkably normal Akk. prose word order. In the entire K corpus, there is only one example in which the verb is not clause-final:[237] *u kaspu [š]a*[238] *mŭhhī[š]u uttahhir-mi danniš* "and the silver which he owes is greatly in arrears" 5:94:10f. It is more likely that the adverb follows the verb for greater emphasis, than that there is some substrate influence at work here.

The usual order of the sentence constituents in all the text genres is: (S)-(O)-(A)-V.[239] The parentheses indicate constituents that occur in some, but not all, sentences. Some examples: *[u] šar GN 400 kaspa [š]âšu*[240]

---

[235]Cf. *GAG* §§130c,131.

[236]Clauses with the stative are discussed in a separate section, below.

[237]Another occurs with a stative; see below. Two other examples are found according to Nougayrol's translations. One is 4:192:6ff., for his and our interpretation of which, see above, p. 88, and n. 225. The other is in a broken context: *u kaspa mullâ ša napš[ãti 3 mana (ša istên amīli?)] ušallamūni mãrū GN [...* Nougayrol translates: "alors, en argent, (comme) compensation des vie[s, 3 mines par homme] ils paieront, les fils de Carke[miš]" There is no reason, however, that *mãrū GN* could not be part of the following sentence.

[238]For this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202.

[239]These symbols represent S(ubject), O(bject), A(d-verbial phrase), P(redicate).

[240]For this reading, cf. p. 35, n. 60.

mithāriš ana muhhi PN *iltakan-mi* "and the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN at the same time" 5:94:17f.; *u mārū* GN *makkūr(?)šunu unūtēšunu akanna ušallamūni* "and the citizens of GN will repay their possessions and vessels appropriately" 4:155:17f.; *šākinnu 140 šiqil kaspa ana* PN *ittadin* "The prefect has given 140 shekels of silver to PN" 4:178:8ff. Certain adverbs (e.g., *anumma*, *inanna*) and adverbial phrases (e.g., *urram šēram*, *ana panī* X, *ina arki ūmī*) by their very nature come first in the sentence;[241] these will be symbolised by Ap (preposed adverb).

Several variations on the basic word order occur. For example, the direct object occasionally precedes the subject: e.g., *kaspa šâšu* PN *ušallim* (O-S-V) "PN will(?) pay that silver 4:177:20f.[242] Sporadically, an adverbial (prepositional) phrase comes before either the subject or the object: e.g., *ša ina libbi* GN *mārat* RN...*ēpušu* (A-S-V) "which the daughter of RN...acquired in GN" 4:127:9f.[243] In some of these cases, the inversion may be to emphasize the constituent in question, but often, no reason for the variation is discernible. It should be noted, finally, that these alternate word orders are more common in the treaties and legal texts than in the letters (where they

---

[241]E.g., 3:3:8f.; 4:162:13'; 4:168:8ff.,13ff.; 4:178:10ff.; cf. *GAG* §131b.

[242]Cf. also ibid.:10f.,22f.(both O-S-V);26ff.(O-S-A-V); 5:95:53f.(O-S-A-V).

[243]Cf. also 4:162:14'.

are in fact quite rare).

b. Clauses with the Stative.[244]

In one clause, the subject follows the verb: *inanna
zaki* PN₁...*ištu qāti* PN₂ (Ap-V-S-A) "Now PN₁ is free (of
claims) from PN₂" *4:189:26. Here the order seems to be
WS.[245] Otherwise, the stative, like the fientic conjuga-
tions of the verb, is always ~~dause~~ clause final. A few examples
will illustrate this; in the same text as the above, note:
300 kaspa habbulātā-mi (O-V) "You owe 300 silver" ibid:5f.,
cf. 8. Other examples are: PN₁ *ištu damī* [*ša ahi*] PN₂
zaku "PN₁ is absolved of the blood of PN₂'s brother" 6:37:
15f.; *enūma hapīrū ittīya ul ašbū* "The Hapiru are not liv-
ing with me" 3:3:6f.; *tamkārū ša qātīya ina* GN *dīkū-mi*
"Traders under my charge were killed in GN" 4:172:4f.;
tuppu annû ištu ša ababi šarri kanik u hepi "This tablet
had been sealed since the time of the king's grandfather,
but was broken" 4:55:20f.

c. Nominal Clauses.[246]

There are a few occurrences of single words other than
verbs which by themselves consitute sentences: e.g., *mūtu
napšatu* "it is death; it is life (i.e., a matter of life

---

[244]See the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

[245]The sg. predicate with a compound subject is also
a WS feature; see below, p. 107.

[246]Cf. *GAG* §126.

and death)" 4:192:20.[247]

In most sentences, however, both subject and predicate are explicitly expressed. When the subject is a noun, the logical predicate is at the end of the clause; thus, e.g., with a nominal predicate, note: *DN₁...DN₆ lū bēlū māmītīšu* "May DN₁:.DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:157:49ff.; with an adverbial predicate: *ša mutši itti PN* "whose husband was with PN" 5:94f.:20. The order is unchanged in relative clauses, when the determinative pronoun is subject: *aššum dīni ša PN₁ ša itti arad PN₂* "concerning the case of PN₁, which concerns (lit.: is with) PN₂'s servant" ibid.:5f.

When the subject is a personal pronoun, the predicate comes first, and the pronoun at the end. Thus, e.g., with a nominal predicate:[248] *ahūšu ša PN šūt mār šarrim-ma šūt* "he is PN's brother; he is the king's own son" 4:193:19ff. The predicate may be a noun phrase rather than a simple noun: *ša kaspi ša PN šū-mi* "It is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN's money" 4:177:16f.

There is also the following example: *tuppa kanku ša ihpû ul ša 4000 kaspi ša idabbubu šū-mi* "The sealed tablet which he broke was not that of the 4000 silver about which he was speaking" 4:177:14ff. In this sentence, the nominal

_____

[247]Perhaps also *kittu altariq-mi* in 4:179:8, if the meaning is: "It is true; I stole (it)," rather than "In truth I stole (it)."

[248]No examples with other types of predicate occur with a pronoun as subject.

subject (*tuppa...iḫpû*) is first, and the predicate (a noun phrase plus *ul*) is second, as in the examples from 5:94f. quoted above. But the subject is also resumed by a personal pronoun (*šū*); like the examples 4:193:19ff. and 4:177:16f., it follows the predicate. Another sentence, of similar construction, and from the same text, has an adjective as predicate: *u 4000 kaspu ša idabbubu annû šū-mi* "and *this* (i.e., what has just been explained) is the 4000 silver about which he was speaking"[249] 4:176:11f.

There is only one exception to the three basic types discussed above: *šumma attūni hapīrū ša dimta šâšu imtaḫḫaṣū-mi* "The Hapiru who kept striking down that tower are not ours" 4:162:3'f. Here the predicate (*attūni*) pre-

---

[249]That *annû* "this" is the logical (as well as the grammatical) predicate here, is clear from the context. The speaker has just explained *what* the silver in question is (*ll*.5-11).

In both examples in this paragraph, a second *tuppu/kaspu* has been deleted in the surface structure; the first one says, in effect: "the sealed tablet...is not (the tablet) of the X silver"; the second: "the 4000 silver is not this (silver)." It is also possible to view the nouns (and their modifiers) at the beginning of both sentences as casus pendentes. If that were the case, the rest of the sentences would be the same type as 4:193:19ff. and 4:177:16f.; the first would thus be translated: "as for the sealed tablet, which he broke--it is not that of the 4000 silver about which he was speaking"; the second would be: "and as for the 4000 silver, about which he was speaking--it is this."

The predicates in both examples are syntactically equivalent to nouns; i.e., the sentences have the shape X Y šū, meaning "X is Y." Now, *GAG* §126f notes that this construction first appears in NA and LB. If that is correct, perhaps the present examples are the result of WS influence. For Hebrew X Y hū’, cf. Joüon, *GHB* §154i, p. 470; for Arabic X huwa Y, cf. Wright, *GAL*, II, §124, p. 258; for Aramaic X hw Y, cf. C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig, Veb Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968), §218, p. 116.

---

cedes the subject.[250] Unless this is to emphasize the pre-

dicate, there is no obvious reason for the inversion.[251]

2. *Modification of the Noun*

a. By an Adjective.

Adjectives are very rare in K; only *annû* "this," *kanku*

"sealed," *rabû* "great," and *šanû* "(an)other" are attested.

The adjective generally agrees with its noun in case, num-

ber, and gender (see below, pp. 314f.). All the examples fol-

low the noun immediately. There are no instances of a noun

modified by more than one adjective, and none of a single

adjective modifiying more than one noun.

---

[250]Nougayrol has: "Ce n'est pas nous, les *Habiru* qui
ont je[té bas] ce 'castel'." J. Aro, *AfO* 18 (1957-8), 243,
pointed out that "unsere Habiru" is more exact. But it is
more likely that *attūni* is used predicatively than attri-
butively here (cf. *CAD* A/2, 513 – *attu* 2a).

[251]Another exception occurs in **4:196, in the greet-
ing: *ittīka mīnum-mê šulmāni ll.*6ff. Nougayrol interprets
this as a question: "Chez toi est-ce que tout va bien?"
Although this is the most likely interpretation, it must be
remembered that *mīnum-mê* is not an interrogative (cf. *CAD*
M/2, 19f.; *AHw*, 656b); thus the sentence itself must be in-
terrogative. This could account for the inversion of sub-
ject and predicate (cf. *GAG* §127c). In *AHw*, 1268a (*šulmānu*
4 b β), von Soden seems to construe this formula, and the
two words that invariably follow it, namely *ṭēma tēr/šupur*
(here *ṭēma tišappara*) "send back news," as one clause,
meaning something like "send back news concerning whatever
well-being is there with (you, etc.)." However, *turru* and
šapāru do not normally take a double acc., which would be
the case here; one would rather expect *ṭēma ša mīnim-mê
šulmāni ša ittīka tēr/šupur* (etc.), for von Soden's inter-
pretation.
    Note that the order of *ittīka mīnum-mê šulmāni* con-
trasts with that of the ubiquitous formula *lū šulmu ana
muhhīka* "Health (be) to you," e.g., *l.*4 in the same text.
This formula is discussed below, pp. 299ff.

b. By a Noun in the Genitive.

There are four constructions used to express a geni-
tive relationship: (i) N_1(bound form) N_2; (ii) N_1 ša N_2;
(iii) N_1-šu[252] ša N_2; (iv) ša N_2 N_1-šu. Note that N_2 is
always in the genitive case. Each of these will be dis-
cussed in the following paragraphs.

(i)   The most common construction is the use of the bound
(construct) form for the nomen regens. However, its high
frequency is misleading, since it is always employed for
certain nouns which occur very often (e.g., šarru, māru,
mārtu, bītu, and the prepositional phrases ana panī, ana
muḫḫi, and ina libbi). If these are discounted, the use
of the bound form is less common than the use of ša (see
below, ii). The modifying noun, in the gen., always follows
the bound form immediately; note that there are no instances
in which a bound form is modified by an adjective, and only
one is modified by a relative clause.[253] Series of more
than one bound form ("construct chains"[254]) are found occa-
sionally; they usually involve a fixed expression (such as
a prepositional phrase) as one of the constituents: e.g.,
ana muḫḫi šar GN 4:176:9. There are no examples in which

---

[252]The suffix agrees with N_2 in number and gender.

[253]5:95:40ff.: aššum dīni sinništi ša mutši itti PN
ša ina GN idūkū ša tašpura "concerning the case of the
woman whose husband was with PN, who was killed in GN,
about which you wrote me." The third ša refers to dīni.

[254]Cf. GAG §135f.

a bound form governs more than one genitive, and none in which two or more bound forms govern a single genitive.

(ii)   The expression of the genitive by means of the deter-minative pronoun *ša*[255] is common. It has an advantage over the use of a bound form in that the genitive does not have to follow the nomen regens directly. Thus, an adjective or pronominal suffix may intervene: e.g., *tuppa kanku ša kaspi šâšu* "the sealed tablet of that silver" 4:176:12f. A rela-tive clause modifying the nomen regens, however, always follows the genitive: *aššum dīni ša PN₁ ša itti arad PN₂ ša tašpura* "concerning the case of PN₁ who is with PN₂'s ser-vant, about which you wrote" 5:94:5f.; *ištu ekallīšu ša GN* "from his palace in (lit.: of) GN" *AnOr*48:12:11.[256]   Some nouns (e.g., *tamkāru* "merchant, trader" and *mullû* "fine, mulct") never appear in the bound form, a genitive always occurring instead with *ša*. The reason for this is not clear. Nor does there appear to be any reason for the choice between constructions i and ii in other instances, apart from the advantages just mentioned. That it is not, e.g., a matter of definite versus indefinite is shown by 4:153f., where *šumma amīlu ša GN₁ ina libbi GN₂ iddâk* in

---

    [255]*ša* in effect stands in apposition to the nomen re-gens, i.e., "N₁, the one of N₂"; cf. *GAG* §138a.

    [256]This is the only example with a suffix on the nomen regens that is not of the type in constructions iii and iv; and it is possible that it too belongs there, if it means instead "from the palace of GN."

ll.4ff. is paralleled by *šumma amīl GN₂ ina libbi GN₁ iddâk* in *ll*.20ff. Both mean "if a man of (one) GN is killed in (the other) GN."

(iii) The construction exemplified by *ahūšu ša PN* ('PN's brother" 4:193:19f.) occurs already in OB and OA, where it is rare, and apparently indicates strong emphasis and marked determination of the nomen regens.[257] It occurs quite frequently in a number of northern WPA dialects,[258] and occasionally in some of the other dialects in the texts found at Ras Shamra.[259] In K, it is found sporadically in each of the text genres: e.g., besides the illustration above (L), *māršu ša RN₁ mār-mārtšu ša RN₂* "the son of RN₁, the grandson of RN₂" 4:154ff.:2f.,45f.(T); *unūtēšu mimma [ša] tamkāri* "any of the trader's vessels" 4:170:7f.(J).[260]

---

[257] *GAG* §138j.

[258] Especially in texts from Nuzi (cf. Wilhelm *Hurro-Akkadisch*, p. 29ff.); Mittanni (*EA* 17-30; cf. Adler, *AKTM*, 92), Boghazkoy (cf. Labat *AkkBo*, 198, and the next note); Amurru in the Amarna tablets (e.g., *EA* 157:17f.,33; 158:7f.; 160:44; etc.), but not in the Amurru texts from Ras Shamra (*PRU* 3:182ff.; 4:132ff.; 4:139ff.; 4:141ff.; 4:144ff.; 4: 180; 4:214; 4:284ff.; and probably 3:10b; 3:13f.; 3:18; 6: 2a).

[259] In texts from Khatti, only in treaties (e.g., *PRU* 4:49:7f.). For U texts, see below, pp. 308f. It does not occur in texts from Siyannu, or from Amurru (see n. 258).

[260] The other occurrences are: *libbašu ša šamši* 4:192: 17(L); *mutši ša sinništi* 5:95:46(L); *mār-mārtšu ša RN* 4:121: 3; 4:127:3; 4:165:3(all J); *mār-mārtši ša PN* 4:208:6(J). In *AnOr*48:12:11(J), *ištu ekallīšu ša GN* may be another example; but see above, p. 100, and n. 256.

The origin of this construction is quite problematic. 'Von Soden[261] would attribute its use in LB to Aramaic influence (*bəreh dî PN* "son of PN"). H.-P. Adler[262] would see the same influence in its occurrence in the Amarna letters of Tushratta.. It is possible that the former is correct; however, the construction is a *late* Aramaic development; it does not occur in early inscriptions at all,[263] and only rarely in Biblical Aramaic.[264] Thus, its appearance in Tushratta's correspondence must originate elsewhere. G. Wilhelm[265] has, with reservations, suggested the Canaanite "pleonastic genitive." However, that construction occurs only in Phoenician, very rarely, and does not incorporate a determinative pronoun.[266] Perhaps its origin must be considered along with that of the last type of construction.

(iv) Very rarely, the genitive (after *ša*) *precedes* the

---

[261]*GAG* §138k.

[262]*AKTM*, 92.

[263]Rainer Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft, Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner, 1969) §§67f., pp. 84ff., especially §68, p. 89.

[264]Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, rev. ed. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963) §48, p. 25.

[265]*Hurro-Akkadisch*, pp. 29f.

[266]Johannes Friedrich and Wolfgang Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, 2nd. ed. (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1970), §309, p. 158.

nomen regens, which usually takes a pronominal suffix. The
only examples are: *ša tamkārī (šâšunu)* NÌ.GU₄.MEŠ-*šu-nu*
unūtu/ēšunu "the possessions (and) vessels of (those) tra-
ders" 4:156f.:24f.,41; cf. 4:159:16,31f.; probably also *ša*
mārī GN ⌈qātšun⌉u ⌈l⌉*īlli* "the citizens of GN must renounce
claim" 4:162:4'f.,[267] without a suffix: *ša* PN ŠU *ītli* "PN
must renounce claim" 5:95:29f.[268] The same construction
is found sporadically in texts from Boghazkoy[269] and Nuzi,[270]
somewhat more frequently in the Amarna letters from Mit-
tanni.[271] But it seems never to be as common as the pre-
ceding construction. In texts from these other regions,
the pronominal suffix on the nomen regens is always present.
As Adler points out,[272] the *ša* N_2 N_1-*šu* structure under con-
sideration probably has nothing to do with the same format
found in native Akk. poetry. However, I cannot agree with
him in considering its origin to be a result of Hurrian in-
fluence.[273] In that language, the nomen rectum (marked by

---

[267]Perhaps also ⌈*ša(?)* *šar*⌉ GN *ṣābūsu narkabātūšu* ⌈...
l⌉*ā illakū* "The troops and chariots of the king of GN will
not have to go(?)" 4:151:7f.

[268]Perhaps also ⌈*š*⌉*a* PN *qa-at ītli-mi* 3:8:29. For
this expression, see above, p. 45f.

[269]Labat, *AkkBo*, 198f.

[270]So Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 42; however, Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akka-
disch*, 29ff., does not mention any examples.

[271]Adler, *AKTM*, 92.

[272]Ibid., 92f.

[273]Ibid., 110.

a genitive postposition) usually precedes the noun it modi-
fies (although it may also follow it[274]); but the nomen
rectum does not take a pronominal suffix.[275] A closer
parallel, it seems, is Hittite.[276] This would be suitable
perhaps for most of the dialects in which the present con-
struction occurs; but it is highly unlikely that Hittite
would have influenced the dialect of the Mittanni letters.
Moreover, as mentioned above, it seems reasonable to assume
that the origins of the constructions iii and iv should be
sought together. But the Hittite equivalent of iii is
found only when the genitive is an indefinite pronoun.[277]
As yet, then, no acceptable solution presents itself.

c. By a Relative Clause.

     Closely related to the modification of the noun by a
noun in the genitive is modification by an attributive re-
lative clause.[278] Most relative clauses are of this type.

---

[274]Cf. *EA* 24:III:39ff.,89ff., IV:32f.,65, all cited in
Bush, "Hurrian," pp. 174, 271, 265, 266, respectively.

[275]Cf. Bush, "Hurrian," 129f., and the examples cited
in n. 274, above.

[276]Cf. Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*
I, 3rd. ed. (Heidelburg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag,
1974), §210(222)a, p. 122; the construction is: N_2 (gen.)
N_1 + pron. suff., e.g., GUD-*aš* IGI-*ŠU* "the eye of an ox."
The more usual construction in Hittite omits the pronominal
suffix, the genitive remaining before the nomen regens
(ibid., §209).

[277]Friedrich, op. cit. (n. 276), §210(222)b, p. 123.

[278]*GAG* §165e. Relative clauses are discussed below,
pp. 134ff.

They always follow the noun, and its adjective or nomen
rectum, when these occur. The noun may be in any case.
Some examples: noun in the nom.: *800 kaspu ša PN ša ana*
muhhīya hubbul "PN's 800 silver, which was owed by me" 5:
94:18ff.; noun in gen.: *aššum dīni sinništi ša mutši itti*
PN "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was with
PN" ibid.:40f.; noun in acc.: *šumma haptrī ša dimta imhaṣū*
[*nīdē*]-*mi* "We do not know the Hapiru who struck down that
tower" 4:162:2'f. On two occasions, attributive relative
clauses without *ša* (i.e., *bīt īpušu*) possibly occur; see
above, p. 88, and n. 222; and below, p. 135.

d. By a Noun in Apposition.

    Another means of qualifying a noun is by simple appo-
sition.[279] The qualifying noun appears second. There are
no peculiarities in this feature in K, and a few examples
will serve to illustrate it: *X kaspa mullâ...iltakan* "He
imposed a fine of X silver" 4:178:6ff.; *PN tamkāru ardu ša*
šar GN "PN the merchant, the servant of the king of GN" 4:
169:2. Apposition is also sometimes used to express the
material out of which an object is made: e.g., *unūte si-*
parri "vessels of bronze" 4:167:11 (but note the use of the
bound form of the nomen regens in *unūt siparri* 4:127:7).
The indefinite pronouns may also stand in apposition to a
noun:[280] *dīna mimma* "any legal action" *AnOr48:12:23.*

_____

    [279]Cf. *GAG* §134.

    [280]See above, pp. 38f.

3. *Agreement*

The letters are remarkably consistent in terms of ag-
reement. There are no pl. subjects with sg. verbs, and no
sg. subjects with pl. verbs. All adjectives agree with
the nouns they modify in case, number, and gender: e.g.,
amīlīka annūtī "these men of yours" 3:8:25; *middati šāši*
"that measurement" 4:194:9f. And all pronouns have the
same number and gender as the nouns to which they refer.

Text 4:54f., a royal edict, may contain one instance
of a sg. subject with a pl. verb: *šumma...RN...e-er-ri-šu*
"if...RN...demands" *ll*.12f. However, the verb could just
as easily be an incorrect subjunctive.

In the treaty texts, the pl. *unūtū/ēšunu*[281] is twice
construed with a sg. verb, *ihalliq*, in 4:156f.:25,41f.
Otherwise, these texts too show no lack of correct agree-
ment.

The legal texts, however, contain a number of errors
in this regard. Most of the mistakes are due to the formu-
laic nature of these documents. Thus, e.g., four texts[282]
correctly have *X u Y ana dīni išniqū* "X and Y went to court."
But four others[283] have instead *X itti Y*, with the verb

---

[281]That *unūtu* is pl. is shown by *unūte...qaqqadšunū-ma*
"the vessels, ...their principal" in 4:153:15ff. But per-
haps it was felt by some scribes to denote a unit ("pro-
perty").

[282]4:172:2f.; 4:176:2; 4:178:2f.; 4:179:2f.

[283]4:166:2f.; 4:168:2ff.; 6:36:2f.; 6:37:2f.

still in the pl., but now incorrectly.[284] Similarly, in

the prohibition "X may not contest," which occurs near the

end of most legal texts, the subject usually sg.,[285] and

so the verb is *iraggum*. When the subject is pl., which is

the case four times, the verb is also usually pl. (three

times[286]); but once,[287] *iraggum* occurs, probably because

the scribes were more accustomed to writing it. Apart from

these examples, there is only one other instance of lack of

agreement between subject and verb:[288] *inanna zaki PN$_1$ u*

PN$_2$ ahūšu u mārūšunu ištu qāti PN$_3$ "Now PN$_1$ and PN$_2$ and

their children are free (of claims) from PN$_3$" *4:189:26ff.

The word order of this sentence (V-S-A) is WS rather than

Akk., and it is quite likely that the concord, with the

verb agreeing only with the first noun after it, is a WS

feature as well.[289]

---

[284]This happens even in OB; cf. *GAG* §132f.

[285]E.g., 4:167:20ff.,23ff.; 4:128:13ff.; and often.

[286]4:122:15ff.; 4:173:16ff.; 4:174:17'ff.

[287]4:171:22f.

[288]In *gabba unūte annūti ana PN irtīhū* "all these ves-
sels belong to PN" 4:167:19, the subject, even though in
the wrong case, is probably *unūte annūti*, with *gabba* in ap-
position; cf. above, p. 42. In *mīnum-mê mārat RN$_1$...lū
kaspu lū hurāṣu lū erû lū unūt siparri...lū kitû...gabba
ana RN$_2$...irtīhū* "whatever the daughter of RN$_1$..., whe-
ther silver or gold or copper or vessels of bronze...or
tunic, belongs entirely to RN$_2$..." 4:127:5ff., the verb is
apparently agreeing with the objects in the list; *mīnum-mê
mārat RN$_1$* is thus in apposition; *gabba* is an adverbial acc.

[289]Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §150q, p. 462; Wright, *GAL*, II, §150,

There is one possible instance of a change of number between two clauses: *šumma a[rk]i tuppi annî amîlî ša ana šîmi iddinū ušellû, kî šarrāqi mullâ umalla* "If after this tablet, they produce men whom they sold, he will pay a fine like a thief" 4:163:30'f. The subjects of all the clauses in this sentence are impersonal--they do not refer to anyone in particular. Elsewhere in K, such verbs are always 3mp.[290] Thus, the sg. *umalla* is quite unexpected, especially after the pl. verbs in the protasis. One wonders whether the grammatical objects have become the logical subjects of their respective clauses, with the result that the verbs agree with them. The sentence could thus be translated: "If after this tablet, men who were sold are produced, as (in the case of) a thief, a fine will be paid." A less likely possibility is that all the verbs are sg., the forms in -*u* being incorrect subjunctives. Another instance of a possible subjunctive, after *šumma*, in 4:54:12f., was quoted earlier in this section.

In only one legal text is there a lack of agreement between a noun and its adjective; the cases are different in *tuppa kanku* "sealed tablet" 4:177:14,[291]18. In both

---

p. 294. Yet another probable West-Semitism occurs in the text, in *lā itūr(a)* "may not return" *ll.*19,20; see above, pp. 57f.

[290]See the next section.

[291]Nougayrol's transliteration has *tup-pu*, but the copy has *tup-pa*.

instances, the phrase is nom. Perhaps the two previous

occurrences of *tuppa kanka* (*ll*.10,12), which are acc., in-

fluenced the form of *tuppa* in *ll*.14,18; but then it is

difficult to understand why *kanku* is in the correct case.

In 4:162:3', the ms pronoun *šâšu*[292] modifies *dimta*, which

is probably f. (but see above, p. 25, n. 62).

It should be noted at this point that the K texts ex-

hibit f. pl. forms only in nouns and adjectives. But

m. pl. *šâšunu*, which is actually a pronoun, is used to

modify f. pl. nouns;[293] another f. pl. noun (*napšâtu*) is

referred to by m. -*šunu*;[294] and the only verb that should

be f. pl. is the m. *irtīhū*.[295]

4. *Unspecified (Impersonal) Subject*

To express an unspecified subject ("one"; German "man"),

or as a circumlocution for the passive, the 3mp is used.[296]

This is found a few times in each of the K text types, and

it is usually best to translate the sentence by a passive

construction. Some examples are: *nikkassē ša harrānāti*

šâšunu ētapšū-mi u X bilat kaspa ana muhhi šar GN iltaknū

"The accounts of those caravans were settled, and X talents

---

[292]The fs is *šâši*; cf. 4:194:10; 5:95:51.

[293]4:173:2'; 4:176:8; 4:208:7; see above, p. 36.

[294]4:168:9; see above, p. 32, n. 51.

[295]4:208:11; see above, p. 54.

[296]Cf. *GAG* §75i.

of silver were imposed on the king of GN" 4:176:8ff.(J);[297]

ina šērti umaššarūka "In the morning you will be released"
*5:109:10(L).[298] In 4:154ff., note that a G verb alternates
with the corresponding N in parallel sentences: (*šumma...*)
*dāikūtīšunu iṣabbatūni l.*20, but *(šumma...) dāikūšunu iṣ-*
*ṣabbatūni l.*30, cf. 8,36; both mean "(if...) their murderers
are caught" (T).[299]

In one instance, 4:163:31', quoted in the previous
section, the sg. seems to serve the same purpose as the
pl. does elsewhere: *umalla* "one will pay."

5. *Negation*

Both *lā* and *ul* occur in K, the former being by far the
more frequent.[300] Both are used in main clauses and in the
protasis of conditional sentences;[301] e.g., in main clauses:

---

[297]Other examples in J: 4:151:10,15,16.

[298]Other examples in L: 4:192:14; 3:6:10 (read *iš-pu-
ru-ni-ik-ku*; the *a*-vowels in the transliteration are typo-
graphical errors).

[299]On the alternation *dāikūšunu*(nom.)/*dāikūttīšunu*(acc.),
see above, pp. 46f. For other examples in T, cf. 4:153f.:
8,14(bis),19.

[300]*ul* occurs five times, *lā* 26, not counting over 15
occurrences in *lā iraggum* "may not contest," throughout the
legal texts.

[301]*ul* occurs sporadically in conditional clauses in MB
(and in Mari OB) according to *GAG* §161b (and cf. Aro, *SMbG*,
144f.). There seems to be little, if any, difference in
meaning whether *ul* or *lā* is used, in spite of von Soden's
attempt to delineate one. No examples of subordinate (in-
cluding relative) clauses with negatives occur in K. *enūma*
in 3:3:6 (and elsewhere in K) is probably an adverb; see
below, pp. 140f.

PN ana tummî lā imangur "PN would not agree to take an
oath" 4:167:18; *PN unūtēšu mimma ša tamkāri...ul ušēli* "PN
did not produce any of the trader's property" 4:170:7ff.;
in protases: *šumma dāikūšunu lā iṣṣabbatū* "if their mur-
derers are not caught" 4:156:36; *šumma atta ul tīdēšu* "in
case you do not know him" 4:193:17f.[302]

Only *lā* is used for prohibitions (negative commands).
Occasionally, it occurs alone: e.g., *ina ekalli ša šar GN*
appūna lā elli u RN ahūši ittīša lā idabbub "She may not,
moreover, go up to the palace of the king of GN; and RN
her brother may not speak with her" *AnOr*48:12:13ff.; *[m]amma*
lā unakkaršunūti "no one may alter them" 4:188:13f. How-
ever, probably because it is also used to negate simple
assertions, and therefore does not of itself indicate a
prohibition, *lā* is often preceded by the injunctive par-
ticle *lū* for such expressions;[303] thus, in a text that
closely parallels the last cited: *mamma lū lā unakkaršunūti*
3:7:17f. Other examples are: *libbašu ša šamši mimma lū lā*
imalla "May the Sun's heart not be full (of anger) at all"
4:192:17ff.; *[ša]r GN ana [dīni(?) m]imma lū lā unamma[šū]šu*

---

[302]This is the only protasis with a negative that oc-
curs in the letters; all the protases with a negative in
the treaties have *lā* (seven times); none occur in the legal
documents.

[303]*lā* alone occurs in prohibitions 21 times, but 15 of
those are in the ubiquitous clause ...*lā iraggum* "may not
contest..." in 4:167:20ff.,23ff.; etc. (all J). *lū lā* oc-
curs five times (cited below), in effect almost as often as
simple *lā*. *GAG* §81h notes *lū lā* for the prohibitive only in
NA; *AHw*, 559b (*lū* A 5), however, lists MA occurrences also.

"one (lit.: they) may not take the king of GN to court(?)
in any way" 4:151:9f.; cf. also 4:54f.:14f., and probably
*5:91:15.

The vetitive does not occur.

6. *The Particle* lū

the particle *lū* (always written *lu-ū*) has several uses
in K. In non-verbal sentences, it indicates a will toward
a condition or state:[304] e.g., *lū šulmu ana muhhīka* "May
you be well (lit.: may well-being be to you)" 3:3:4, and *p.*
in the letters; *DN₁...DN₂ lū bēlū māmītīšu* "may DN₁...DN₆
be the lords of his oath" 4:157:49ff. It has the same
function with stative verbs (i.e., it forms the jussive of
the stative):[305] e.g., *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū ṣabtū* "they (the
borders) must remain in their very place" 3:7:15f.; *mala
mūraktēši lū arik* "they (lit.: it) should be as wide as its
(the measurement's) width" 4:194:12f.

Three times in one text, *lū* transforms a dur. into a
(polite?) injunction:[306] *ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tētenep-
puššu* "You should treat him well, according to his rank" 4:
193:10ff.,22ff.; *ana sisîšu šê tibna lū tattanaddin-ma* "You
should constantly give his horses grain and straw" ibid.:15f.
This injunctive *lū* is also used to strengthen *lā* in prohi-

[304]Cf. *GAG* §127d.

[305]Cf. *GAG* §81b.

[306]Cf. *GAG* §81e.

bitions; for examples, see the previous section, on nega-

tion.

Finally, in a non-injunctive function, *lū* precedes

items in lists, with the meaning "whether...or":[307] *lū*

ardu lū amtu "whether male or female servant" 4:163:23';

cf. 4:127:5ff. (quoted above, p. 107, n. 288); 4:160:12'f.

7. *Non-coordinating Enclitic -ma*

The particle *-ma* may occur, as elsewhere in Akk., on

words other than the verb, in a capacity other than that of

connector.[308] Generally, it is thought to impart some

special emphasis to the word to which it is attached.[309]

In grammatical terms, it is most likely that enclitic *-ma*,

when not used to coordinate clauses, serves to mark the

logical predicate of a sentence, "the main point of a sen-

tence when that element is not the verb."[310] This obser-

vation holds true for most of the examples of non-coordi-

nating *-ma* in K: e.g., *mīnum-mê pāṭuka ša PN iškunakku*

---

[307]Cf. *GAG* §117c-d.

[308]In L: 3:7:15; 4:188:11,20; 4:193:20; in T: 4:153f.:
12,18,23; for 4:155:19, see n. 317, below; in J: 4:163:19',
25',29'; *AnOr*48:12:12. For 4:164:4; 4:165:2; 4:127:4; 4:
121:2f.; 4:150:2; *AnOr*48:11:3,5, see the last paragraph of
this section. For *-ma* as a conjunction (including its at-
tachment to the sender of a letter, after *umma*), see below,
pp. 117ff.

[309]Cf. *GAG* §123a.R.Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis
..." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los
Angeles, 1971), discusses this use of *-ma* on pp. 59f., 105ff.

[310]Anson F. Rainey, "Enclitic *-ma* and the logical pre-
dicate in Old Babylonian," *IOS* 6 (1976), 51.

ašaršunū-mā-mi[311] *lū ṣabtū* "Whatever your borders, which

PN set up for you, it is in their (present) place that

they must be maintained"[312] 3:6:9ff.; *unūte ša ittīšu ihal-*

liqū šalāšīšu-ma(3-šú-ma) umalla "It is threefold that he

will repay the vessels that were lost with him" 4:153:10ff.[313]

Obviously, the cleft sentence pattern that is used to in-

dicate a non-verbal logical predicate in English is awkward

at times,[314] and a simple emphatic rendering may be pre-

ferred: e.g., *u šumma ana mamma amīli šanîm-ma*[315] *ana šīmi*

nattadin-mi "nor (oath formula) have we given to *any* other

man for a price" 4:163:25',29'. The translation must not

obscure, however, the fact that *-ma* marks the logical pre-

dicate of the sentence.

---

[311]Note the *-mi* at the end of the word, indicating
a direct quote. In K, *-mi* almost invariably goes with the
predicate of the sentence; see above, p. 90.

[312]*ašaršunū-mā-mi* here and *ašrašunū-ma* in 4:188:11
must be taken as adverbial acc.'s (of place); see below,
p. 157.

[313]In the same text, there occurs *u unūte ša itttšu*
ihalliqū mala ša ihalliqū qaqqadšunū-ma umallû "and as for
the vessels that were lost with him--it is the principal
of them, as much as were lost, that they will make good"
4:154:15ff. *unūte ša itttšu ihalliqū* forms a casus pendens,
for which see below, pp. 162f.

[314]Cf. Rainey, *IOS* 6, p. 58.

[315]The only other time *šanû* occurs in K, it again has
-ma: *ina āli šanîm-ma ultešibši* "In *another* city he made
her dwell" *AnOr* 48:12:12. One wonders whether *šanû* always
took *-ma* in this dialect; but, of course, three examples
are not enough to generalize. In U, *šanû* is normally not
followed by *-ma*: e.g., 3:114:20; 3:126:25; 5:5:3'(fem.);
5:11:11. In texts from Khatti, it usually has *-ma* (e.g.,
PRU 4:52:10,15bis; *Ug.* 5:106:side,2), but occasionally oc-
curs alone (e.g., *PRU* 4:42:33).

In nominal sentences, the logical predicate will usu-
ally, though not always,[316] be the same as the grammatical
predicate, and it too may be marked for emphasis with -ma:
mār šarrim-ma šūt "He is the king's own son" 4:193:20f.;
mullâ akannā-ma "The fine is the same" 4:154:23.

There are, however, occurrences of non-coordinating
-ma that do not fit the above comments. In two of them,
-ma occurs on the verb, but is not a conjunction; one is:
appūnā-ma ana sisêšu šê tibna lū tattanaddin-ma šumma atta
ul tīdêšu ahūšu ša PN šūt "Moreover you should constantly
give his horses grain. In case you do not know him, he is
PN's brother" 4:193:13ff. Here šumma clearly begins a new
sentence, and so -ma must end the foregoing one. The other
example is more blatant, since -ma ends a paragraph, a
whole section of text: u mārū GN...mullâ...umallûnim-ma
"and the citizens of GN... will pay the fine..." 4:157:42ff.
The significance of -ma in these two cases remains obscure;
emphasis seems an unlikely reason for its occurrence.

Another group of occurrences of -ma that does not fit
the description of use given above is found in the intro-
ductions of the K legal texts. As elsewhere, these begin
ana panī RN "in the presence of RN." The K examples always

---

[316]Vs. Rainey, *IOS* 6, 56. It is reasonable to assume
that a question such as "Who is in the house?" could be
answered with šarrum-ma ina bīti "(It is) the king (who)
is in the house."

contain *-ma* somewhere in the genealogy, whenever one is given; the particle does not always appear in the same place in the genealogy, however. The passages all begin with *ana panī RN₁ šar GN*, and then continue as follows:

1. *mār RN₂ šar GN-ma mār-mārīšu ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi*[317]

2. *mār RN₂ šar GN-ma mār-mārīšu ša RN₃ šar GN   qarrādi*[318]

3. *mār RN₂ šar GN   mār-mārīšu ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi*[319]

4. *mār RN₂ šar GN   mār-mārīšu ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi u*
      ana panī RN₄ mār RN₅ šar GN₂[320]

The K texts are the only ones in the Ras Shamra corpus to exhibit this feature. Elsewhere, it is attested in MA and NA genealogies, and seems to mean "also."[321]

---

[317] 4:121:1ff.

[318] 4:165:1ff.

[319] 4:127:1ff.; 4:164:1ff.

[320] *AnOr*48:11:1ff.

[321] *AHw* 569f. (*-ma* A. 2 b). If *-ma* occurs in 4:155:19, its nuance must remain obscure as long as the line itself is unclear: *ū šum-ma LÚ-ma UZU ka-a-ma i-ṣa-ba-tu₄-ni*, for which Nougayrol proposes: "Si les fils du Carkemiš trouve(?) ainsi (des) hommes(??)," noting (*PRU* 4, 155, n. 2) that LÚ UZU is otherwise unattested, and that in any case ṣabātu here is "maladroit." The line does not appear in the parallel paragraph, *ll*.36ff. Nougayrol's suggestion that the sense of LÚ UZU is probably "corpse" seems quite reasonable. I would offer, with much hesitation, a slight emendation, and read: *ū šum-ma LÚ-laͣ-am UG₇ ka-a-ma i-ṣa-ba-tu₄-ni* "and if they find(?) a dead man (*amīlam mīta*) in this way." Admittedly, mimation otherwise is not found explicitly written except on a few fixed expressions (see above, pp. 26f.).

8. *Coordination of Clauses*

Our discussion of clausal coordination, or parataxis, will refer in large part to the most thorough investigation of parataxis to date, that of R. Patterson on OB Hammurapi letters and the Code of Hammurapi.[322] Coordination of clauses in K may be accomplished by the particle *-ma*, by the conjunctions *u* "and," *ū* "or," or asyndetically.

a. Coordination with *-ma*.

The particle *-ma* is used to coordinate clauses[323] only sporadically in K. There are 14 examples in the treaties and legal texts, six in the letters (four in one letter alone).[324] In OB, clauses joined by *-ma* are irreversible, that is, they cannot be put in the opposite order without

[322]Richard D. Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis as Exhibited in the Royal Letters of the Middle Old Babylonian Period and in the Code of Hammurapi" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970); University Microfilms no. 71-14007.

[323]For *-ma* other than as a clause connector (i.e., as an "emphatic" particle), see above, 113ff. For *-ma* in coordination in MB, see Aro, *SMbG*, 136ff.

[324]In J: 4:161ff.:15',18',23',27'; 4:166:8; *4:189: 17' 4:293:7'; cf. **4:171:8; in T: 4:156f.:31,37,44; 4: 158f.:7,17 (also [22,28]); in 4:54:7(E); in L: 3:4a:9; 4: 193:16; 5:95:29,33,38,50. The six occurrences in the letters do not include the ubiquitous *ana X qibī-ma* found in the beginning of each of the letters, as it is elsewhere in Akk. The interpretation of *-ma* in this expression is still debated, and beyond the scope of the present work; cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff. For letter introductions in general in the texts found at Ras Shamra, see Nougayrol's comments in *PRU* 3, 2f., *Ug.* 5, 66f. In most OB letters, *-ma* also follows the name of the sender: *umma .Y-ma* "thus (says) Y" (cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff.); in K, this is the case only when the sender is identified simply as "the king," but always in such cases: 4:193; 5:103; *5:90; *5:108; cf. 4:54:1(Edict).

substantially altering the meaning of the sentence.[325] The

same can be said for all the occurrences of -ma in K. Some

examples: u anumma PN ātabak-ma ittalak "I have hereby

sent off PN, and he has gone" 3:3f.:8f.; mīnum-mê ardī...

šar GN lipahher-mā-mi ana RN litēr-mi "Let the king of GN

gather all the servants..., and return (them) to RN" 4:163:

21'ff.; mārū GN illakūnim-ma ina GN₂ ina māmīti itammûni

"The citizens of GN will come and swear by an oath in GN₂"

4:156:21f.

Often, the mood, even the tense, is the same in both

clauses coordinated by -ma, as in the examples just cited.

However, as in OB,[326] it is possible for -ma to join clauses

where the moods differ: e.g., in a sentence which occurs

four times in 4:158ff., and which is almost identical to

the last example of the preceding paragraph: ˹mārū GN₁˺...

illakūnim-ma˺ ina GN₂ litmû "the citizens of GN₁ will come

...that they may swear in GN₂" 4:158ff.:28ff. (reconstructed

on the basis of ll.6f.,13f.,22f.).

As in OB,[327] -ma implies either (a) a sequence of

events in the clauses it connects (e.g., 3:3f.:8f., 4:163:

21'ff., above), or (b) the logical, or "undifferentiated,"[328]

subordination of the clause containing -ma to the following

---

[325]Patterson, "Parataxis," 45f., 114.

[326]Ibid., 50f., 73f.

[327]Ibid., chapter 3.

[328]Ibid., 86f.

clause. Thus, the last two examples quoted above (4:156:
21f.; 4:158ff.:28ff.) could be translated as expressions
of purpose (final clauses):[329] "The citizens of GN will
come to swear..." Another example is: *PN₁ qadu šībūtīšu
litmā-ma PN₂ kaspašu lišallimšu* "Let PN₁ and his witnesses
swear, so that PN₂ may/must repay him his silver" 5:95:32ff.
The particle may also have an adversative nuance:[330] *u
sākinnu 5000 šiqil kaspa ilteqē-ma lā ittadinšu* "and the
prefect took 5000 shekels of silver, but did not give {it}
to him" (or: "Although the prefect took..., he did not
give...") 4:166:8f. In all the instances where clauses are
joined by *-ma*, it may be said that, as in OB,[331] the main
stress of the sentence lies with the clause following the
-ma, whereas the clause with *-ma* depicts a circumstance
attendant to, or leading up to, the following clause.

There are two instances of *-ma* on verbs in which it
does not act as a conjunction. These were quoted in the
previous section (p. 115). Apart from these, however, *-ma*
is used in K in the same manner as it is in OB. The essen-
tial difference is that it occurs far less frequently in
K.

---

[329]Cf. ibid., 70.

[330]Cf. ibid., 80ff.

[331]Cf. ibid., 45f., 113.

b. Coordination with *u*.

By far the most common means of coordinating two clauses is to use the conjunctive particle *u* "and." *u* is also used in OB, though much less often than *-ma*.[332] Clauses joined by *u* in OB may be fully reversible, or, due to the nature of the words or the context involved, they may sometimes be irreversible.[333] Examples of both possibilities are found in K. Clauses whose order could be reversed, e.g., are: *ina ekalli ša šar GN appūna lā elli u RN ahūši ittīša lā idabbub* "She may not go up, moreover, into the palace of the king of GN, and RN, her brother, may not speak with her" *AnOr*48:12:13ff.; *ardūya šunū-mi u ina tuppīya kanki šaṭrū-mi* "They are my servants, and are inscribed in my sealed tablet" 4:168:5f. Note also the frequent prohibition at the end of most legal texts: *PN$_1$ ...ana muhhi PN$_2$ lā iraggum u PN$_2$...ana muhhi PN$_1$ lā iraggum* "PN$_1$ may not contest against PN$_2$..., and PN$_2$ may not contest against PN$_1$..." e.g., 4:167:20ff.; 4:170:19ff. As examples of clauses in which the order could not be reversed without altering the meaning may be cited: *PN ittama u mārū GN ušallimū* "PN swore and (then) the citizens of GN repaid" 4:170:15ff.; *ina libbi bīt kīli iltakanšū-mi u ina libbi bīt [kīl]i imtūt-mi* "He put him in prison, and he died in

_____

[332]Cf. ibid., 19f.

[333]Ibid., 33ff.

prison." 6:36:6ff.

In OB, clauses connected by *u* must always contain predicates of the same mood (i.e., indicative or injunctive).[334] This is true in most of the cases in K (note, e.g., all of the preceding examples). However, there are exceptions: e.g., *u šarru mullâ ana muhhi PN šalaštišu iltakan u mullâ šalaštišu limalli* "and the king imposed on him a fine of three-fold compensation, and (or: with the result that) he must pay a fine of three-fold compensation" 4:179:9ff. Here, *-ma* would be expected in native Akk. (at least, as represented by the OB of Hammurapi[335]), but its place has been taken by *u*. As noted above, in OB material, when *-ma* connects two clauses, the emphasis is always on the second one. In that same corpus, clauses connected by *u* bear equal emphasis.[336] This too often holds true in K; but, as the last example quoted shows, the emphasis (or "thought stress"[337]) is sometimes clearly directed toward the second clause only. As another illustration, note: *anumma PN₁ itti PN₂ illakūnikku u paṭīka išakkan(n)ūnikku* "Now then PN₁ and PN₂ are coming to you in order to (re-) establish your borders for you" 3:7:19ff. Here too, *-ma*

---

[334]Ibid., 32f., 42.

[335]Ibid., 114 (rule *-ma* 2).

[336]Ibid., 39f., 43.

[337]Ibid., 17.

would be used in OB.

The observations in the above paragraphs may be summarized as follows: -ma as a coordinator is almost always used in K as it is in native Akk.; however, it occurs far less frequently in K; u is often used as it is in Akk.; however, it also often occurs in K where -ma would be expected in Akk.[338] For this reason, the ratio of the number of times -ma is found relative to u is far smaller in K than in native Akk. That u so often displaces -ma is probably due to WS influence, especially since other examples of WS-type usage of u (for *wa-) will be pointed out in the following paragraphs.

In the last passage quoted above (3:7:19ff.), u has replaced what would be -ma in a native Akk. text. A similar, but much clearer, example of WS syntax, in which more than the conjunction is non-Akk., is found in the following: kī maṣī-mê [ṣāb]ī narkabāt[i ša an]a muhhīka ištu ekalli iltaknū šūšir u šamšī minûta eppaš "Prepare as many troops (and) chariots as have been established for you by the palace, so that my Sun may take a count" 4:192:10ff. To express purpose in Akk., the construction here would be: imper. + -ma + prec.[339] In the example, however, the con-

_____

[338]Since more texts lack -ma entirely than contain it, it is possible that many K scribes were unfamiliar with its use, and therefore did not employ it at all, using instead only u.

[339]Cf. GAG §158f.

struction is closer to that used in Hebrew, namely, imper. + *wə-* + jussive (short imperfect).[340]

One very frequent, and quite un-Akk., use of *u* in K is to introduce new sentences, and even new paragraphs. This is especially common in the letters. Consider the following: *ahūšu ša PN šūt mār šarrim-ma šūt u ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tēteneppuššu* "He is PN's brother; he is the king's own son. So treat him well, according to his rank" 4:193:19ff.; *u sākinnu 5000 šiqil kaspa ilteqē-ma lā ittadinšu u šarru PN aššum 4920 šiqil kaspi...ana māmīti ittadinšu* "And the prefect took 5000 shekels of silver, but did not give (it) to him. And the king put him under oath about the 4920 shekels of silver..." 4:166f.:8ff. A test for this use of *u* (i.e., to determine that it is not coordinating two clauses) might be the possibility of substituting a sentence-initial adverb like *anumma* or *inanna* without altering the meaning of the text. This is in fact possible in the examples just given. In some cases, *u* occurs, redundantly it seems, along with *anumma* at the beginning of a paragraph; the following illustration, although rather long, is best quoted in full: *aššum paṭika ša tašpura mīnum-mê paṭūka ša PN₁ iškunakku ašrašunū-ma lū ṣabtū mamma lā unakkaršunūti u anumma PN₂ u PN₃ altapra⸢kku⸣*[341]

---

[340]Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §116d, p. 316. Occasionally, even the regular imperfect is used, as the Akk. dur. is here: e.g., *pəqaḥ-nā' 'et-ᶜênāw wə-yir'eh* "Open his eyes, that he may see" 2Kings 6:17.

[341]For this restoration, see above, p. 56, n. 128.

u pāṭī šâšunu išakkanūnikku "Concerning your borders, about

which you wrote me: whatever borders of yours, which PN[1]

established for you, must be held in their very place. No

one may change them. Also, I hereby send PN[2] and PN[3] to

you, to (re-)establish those borders for you" 4:188:6ff.

In this example,[342] the occurrence of *u* is clearly non-Akk.,

but would not be surprising in a WS dialect.[343]

Another use of *u* that is not found in native Akk.

texts is to introduce the apodosis in conditional sentences

in which the protasis is begun by *šumma*.[344] This occurs in

nearly half the examples, and does not seem to add anything

to the meaning of the sentence. In fact, some texts have

examples of conditional sentences both with and without *u*

to connect the two clauses; compare, e.g., *u šumma tamkārū*

...iddakkū[345] *u dāikūšunu iṣṣabbatūni mārū GN...ušallamūni*

"and if traders...are murdered, and their murderers are

caught, the citizens of GN will pay..." 4:156f.:28ff., but

u šumma dāikūšunu lā iṣṣabbatū u mārū GN illakūnim-ma...

---

[342]Other examples are: 3:3:8f.; *5:109:rll'f.

[343]Cf. Hebrew, where *wǝ-* may begin whole books (e.g.,
way-yiqrā' Leviticus 1:1).

[344]Cf. *GAG* §161; Patterson, "Parataxis," 41, n. 39.
This phenomenon is also encountered in U (see below, p.328),
at Boghazkoy (cf. Labat, *AkkBo*, 78), Nuzi (cf. Gordon, *OrNS*
7, 47; Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadiseh*, p.52), Alalakh (cf. Giacu-
makis, *AkkAl*, 63), Mari (cf. Finet, *ALM*, 240), Byblos (cf.
Moran, "Byblos," 71ff.). For conditional clauses in general,
see below, pp. 129ff.

[345]On this form, see below, p. 131, n. 368.

itammûni "but if their murderers are not caught, the citizens of GN will come...to swear" ibid.:36ff. The similarity of this use of *u* to the so-called *waw* of apodosis in Hebrew is obvious,[346] and it is almost certain that we have here another instance of WS influence.

Related to the occurrence of *u* to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence, is its use to introduce a main clause after a subordinate clause.[347] This occurs four times (three in letters) out of seven examples,[348] and is probably also a WS feature,[349] since it is not normal Akk. usage.

Finally, consider the following series of clauses: *400 kaspu ana muhhi PN...hubbul-mi u kaspu [š]a muhhīšu uttahhir-mi danniš [u] šar GN 400 kaspa [š]âšu mithâriš ana muhhi PN₂ iltakan-mi u 200 kaspa ittannam-mi u 600 kaspu ana muhhīšu irtēh-mi* "400 silver was owed by PN₁; and the silver which he owed was greatly in arrears; and the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN₂ at the same time; and he has given me 200 silver; and 600 silver (still) remain against him" 5:94:8ff. Of course, the clauses could be put into smoother, more idiomatic English; but the translation given brings the point to the fore: there are five

---

[346]Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §176d, p. 531.

[347]See below, pp. 138ff., on subordinate clauses, for examples.

[348]Twice after *undu*, possibly an adverb in K; see p. 140.

[349]Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §176e-i, pp. 531f.

successive clauses connected by *u*. A native Akk. scribe,
even if he wished to use *u*, would not use it four times in
a row; the first three would be deleted.[350] It is almost
as unlikely that an Akk. writer would connect five clauses
in succession with *-ma* (although it is presumably not im-
possible or unknown); some variation would normally occur,
such as beginning a new sentence at some point, or using
subordinate clauses. The above sequence of clauses, then,
is in all probability to be compared with the long sequences,
all connected by *wa-*, that occur in WS dialects.

We have seen, therefore, that in addition to some
examples in which *u* reflects normal Akk. usage, there are
other occasions on which *u* is used where *-ma* is expected.
That this is probably to be attributed to WS influence is
argued by several other uses of *u* that reflect the use of
WS *wa-*, where normal Akk. would have no conjunction.

c. Coordination with *-ma u*.

In one instance, two clauses are coordinated by *-ma u*:
*šarrat GN₁ zittašunu...tittadin-ma u ina GN₂ tultellīšunūti
u...māmīta ina bertēšunu taltakan* "The queen of GN₁ gave
(them) their share..., and then sent them up to GN₂, and
imposed an oath between them" 4:121f.:9ff. In OB, *-ma u*
occurs sporadically, always in irreversible sequences, and
with the meaning "and also, and then."[351] The sole K exam-

---

[350]Patterson, "Parataxis," 185.

[351]Ibid., 117ff.; for MB, see Aro, *SMbG*, 143.

ple would seem to fit these observations as well. At any rate, -ma u had not become a frequent conjunction in K, as it had, e.g., in Nuzi.[352] Note that the order of the clauses could be reversed around the conjunction u in the passage above; i.e., the clause after u (with *taltakan*) could precede the other two, with no change in meaning. The clauses connected by -ma u, however, could not be inverted.

d. Coordination with *ū*.

Although the conjunction *ū* "or" is written the same as u "and" (i.e., *ū*), it is possible to isolate a few likely occurrences of it. Most often it coordinates two oath formulas, which are in effect protases of unfinished conditional sentences:[353] e.g., *šumma karānšunu nēnu nakkis-mi ū šumma amīlī ša karānšunu ikkisū nīdē-mi* "we did not tear down their vineyards, nor do we know the men who tore down their vineyards" 4:162:9'f.[354] In one case, the conjunction is strengthened by the addition of *šumma*:[355] *terraašunūtī-mi ū šumma pūhī ardīya idnam-mi* "Return them to me, or else give me substitutes for my servants" 4:168:5f. As Patterson notes, clauses connected by *ū* are by the very nature of the conjunction always fully reversible, and contain the same

---

[352]Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, pp. 50ff.

[353]The form of the oath is considered below, pp. 160f.

[354]Cf. also 4:162f.17'ff.,24'f.,28f.'.

mood;[355] this is as true in K as it is in OB. Note that there are no occurrences of ū lū in K.[356]

One protasis consists of three protases joined by *yānum-mā* "if not, or else":[357] *šumma RN...itti FN...idabbub i-ia-nu-ma-a ina ekallīšu utāršī i-ia-nu-ma-a...RN... dīna mimmaigerre* "if RN...speaks with FN..., or else returns her to his palace, or if...RN...starts a lawsuit" *AnOr48:12:17ff.*

e. Asyndetic Coordination.

Clauses can also be connected asyndetically in K. Patterson notes that "virtually every type of structure used with the coordinators *u* and *-ma* can be duplicated asyndetically," except when there is a variation of mood in the clauses.[358] Although there are relatively few instances of true asyndetic coordination in K,[359] the examples that do occur suggest that Patterson's observations apply here as well. A few examples will serve to illustrate this: *anumma PN...illakakku ṣābīka u narkabātīka immar* "Now then PN...is coming to you to inspect your troops and chariots" 4:192:6ff.; *arad PN lutammâm-mi akanna liqbi* "Let

---

[355] Patterson, "Parataxis," 127.

[356] Cf. *GAG* §171c; Patterson, "Parataxis," 122ff.

[357] Cf. *CAD* I/J, 324b.

[358] "Parataxis," 161, and n. 75.

[359] Perhaps this is another WS feature.

me adjure PN's servant, that he say as follows" 3:7:14ff.;

u šar GN ištu lēt PN...iptaṭaršu ana ardutti ša šar GN ir-

tēh "and since the king of GN has ransomed him from PN...

he belongs to the ·service of the king of GN" 4:165:5ff.

9. *Subordination*

a. Conditional Sentences.

These are very common, especially (and naturally) in

the treaties and legal documents. They are all introduced

by the particle *šumma*; I can find no clear examples of un-

marked conditional sentences anywhere in K.

When the protasis consists of more than one clause,

those clauses are usually joined by *u*:[360] e.g., *u šumma*

tamkārū...iddakkū[361] *u dāikūšunu iṣṣabbatūni* "and if tra-

ders...are murdered, and their murderers are caught" 4:156:

28ff.[362] In one instance, however, *šumma* is repeated in-

stead: *šumma amīlu ša GN...iddâk šumma ša idūkūšu iṣabbatū*

"if a man of GN...is murdered, and (lit.: if) they catch

the one who murdered him" 4:153:4ff. In another case,

šumma is repeated within the same clause, probably for

clarity, although the result grammatically is anacoluthon:

---

[360]No examples with *-ma* occur.

[361]For the interpretation of *i-da-ku* as N dur., see
below, p. 131, n. 368.

[362]Cf., in the same text, 4:155:19f., and 6ff. (where
-mê--or perhaps simply *-mi*--is attached to *šumma*; see ·above,
p. 89); ·see also 4:158f.:3ff.,20f.; 4:55:16ff.

šumma tuppa kanku ša hepû šumma ša X kaspi šū "if the sealed tablet which was broken--if it was the one of X silver" 4:177:17ff. In one protasis, consisting of three disjunctive clauses, the second and third alternatives are introduced by *yānum-mā*. The sentence, in *AnOr*48:12:17ff., was quoted above, p. 128.

It was noted above (pp. 124f.) that the apodosis in nearly half the conditional clauses begins with *u*, and that this "*u* of apodosis" does not have any perceptible impact on the meaning of the sentence.

There is one passage in which the apodosis has been omitted through ellipsis: *šumma atta ul tīdêšu ahūšu ša PN šūt* "If you do not know him (, I will tell you:) he is PN's brother" 4:193:17ff.

When an action, the potential occurrence of which is being described, is seen as taking place in the future (i.e., as not having occurred yet), the verb of the protasis is dur. or stative. The only example of the latter is in fact a "preformative stative" of *edû*,[363] in 4:193:17ff., quoted in the previous paragraph. There are many examples of the dur.: e.g., *šumma PN ištu māmīti inahhis* "if PN shrinks back from the oath" 4:177:25f.; *šumma RN₁ itti RN₂ lā inakkir u amāte ša aqbû lā eppuš* "if RN₁ is not hostile to RN₂ and does not do the things I have said" 4:55:16ff.; cf. also all the examples with verbal protases quoted above. In the

---

[363]I.e., formally a pret.; cf. *GAG* §78b.

last example, the verb in the relative clause, *aqbû*, is
pret., since it is describing an action that took place in
the past; but the main verbs are dur. Conditional sentences
in K therefore differ from OB, where the verb of the prota-
sis is usually pret.,[364] and also from MB, where the perf.
predominates.[365] In both OB and MB, the dur. is also used,
but only to express intention or a wish (OB[366]), or, appar-
ently, only with verbs that naturally express such notions
(MB[367]). But in K, it is evident that no such nuances are
implied; the fact that there are no exceptions[368] makes the
rule a very simple one: if the potential action is future,
the dur. (or stative) is used.

The apodosis of such sentences is also normally dur.:

---

[364]*GAG* §161d.

[365]Aro, *SMbG*, 144f.

[366]*GAG* §161i.

[367]Aro, *SMbG*, 145.

[368]The writing *i-du-ku-mī* in 4:155:8 (and *i-du-ku-ni* in
4:159:21) could be pret. However, besides the fact that it
would then constitute the only exception to the use of the
dur. (or stative) in a future protasis, two other factors
argue for considering the form to be dur. (*iddukkū*): (a) the
verb of the second clause of the protasis here is a dur.:
iṣ-ṣa-ba-tu₄-mī (N: *iṣṣabbatū-mī*); (b) in a similar context,
another text has *id-da-a-ak* (*iddâk*; N dur.) 4:153f.:6,22.
The form *i-da-ku* in 4:156:29 should probably also be seen as
N dur. (*iddakkū*). Both of these variants of the N dur. of
verbs II-*w* are known elsewhere, although they occur in widely
different periods; GAG §104v lists *izzazzū* (*zâzu* 3mp) in SB,
while the *Ergänzungsheft* to GAG §104v lists *izzazzū* (3ms
subjunctive) in OB. Of course, the possibility of a scribal
error in the case of either *i-du-ku* or *i-da-ku* cannot be
ruled out.

e.g., *šumma iraggum tuppu annû ile''ēši* "If she contests,
this tablet will defeat her" 4:208:9f., and often. Quite
often, however, the prec. is found: e.g., *u šumma mārū GN₁
ištu māmīti inahhisū mullâ šalāštēšu ana mārī GN₂ lišallimū*
"And if the citizens of GN₁ shrink back from the oath, they
must pay a fine threefold to the citizens of GN₂" 4:162:
5'f.[369] There seems to be little, if any, difference in
such cases between the prec. and the dur. in the apodosis.
Compare, e.g., the last example with: *u šumma PN ištu mā-
mīti inahhis kaspa...PN ana šar GN umalla* "And if PN shrinks
back from the oath, PN will make good the silver...to the
king of GN" 4:177:25ff.[370] Obviously, the translations
"must" for the prec., and "will" for the dur., are merely
traditional, and, in these cases, quite contrived, for any
difference between the two, if one existed, cannot be dis-
cerned. It seems, then, that the dur. could have an in-
junctive force, at least, in apodoses.

One example of the perf. in the protasis occurs, but
there the action has already occurred; i.e., it is an action
in the *past: šumma asīru annû X kaspa ilteqe [š]a PN qāt
illī-mi* "If this prisoner has taken the silver, PN must re-
nounce (any) claim"[371] 3:8:28ff. Thus, the difference be-

---

[369]Cf. also 3:8:27ff.; 4:159:20ff.,27ff.; 5:94f.:24ff.,
30ff.

[370]Note that 4:161ff., the text of the previous example,
has as its apodosis *kī šarrāqi mullâ umalla* "he will make
good the fine like a(ny) thief" *l*.31'.

[371]For this rendering, see above, pp. 45f.

tween native Bab. and K with regard to which tenses are used in the protasis is substantial.

There are only two examples of protases that are nominal clauses: 4:177:17ff., in which *šumma* is repeated, quoted above (p. 130, top), and another from the same text: *u šumma ša kaspi ša PN₁ šū u kaspu šâšu PN₂ ú-šal-LIM* "But if it is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN₁'s silver, then PN₂ will repay that silver" ibid.:19ff. The verb of the apodosis is problematic: the dur. is expected. The *LIM* sign is most likely a scribal error.[372] Another difficult conditional sentence, still in the same text, is: *šumma PN itamma u X KÙ.BABBAR PN ilteqe šalim* ll.23ff. The problem is: Where does the apodosis begin? Nougayrol's translation is not quite sound grammatically: "Si [PN] jure (pour) les [X] d'argent qu'il a pris, il est quitte." The *u* must introduce either a second clause in the protasis, or the apodosis. Now, what PN is to swear is mentioned in the previous sentence: *u kaspa ša 400 imērī ša idabbubu PN litma* (ll.22f.), which must be rendered: "And (so), let PN swear about the silver of the 400 asses about which he was speaking."[373] This makes it more likely that *šumma PN itamma* in l .23f. comprises the entire protasis of the sentence in

---

[372]It is unlikely that *LIM* is to be read *lam₅; AS³* no. 261 (pp. 51 and 7*) gives this value only infrequently, for OA and OB.

[373]Nougayrol has: "(Sentence:) Que [PN] jure (que la tablette brisée) (est bien) celle des 400 ânes en question!" This is unlikely, both grammatically and contextually.

question, and that *u* begins the apodosis. I would suggest,
therefore, that *X* KÙ.BABBAR *PN ilteqe* is a *bīt īpušu* con-
struction (without subjunctive),[374] and that the whole sen-
tence should be translated: "If PN swears, then the X sil-
ver PN took is clear (paid)."[375]

In one instance (4:54:12f.), the verb of the protasis,
which has a sg. subject, is either in the subjunctive, or
pl., for no apparent reason; see above, pp. 62f. Another,
less likely instance (4:163:30'), was cited above, p. 108.

The negative in the protasis is always *lā* in the trea-
ties, but *ul* in the only example from the letters; see
above, p. 111, for examples. No examples occur in the le-
gal texts.

b. Relative Clauses.[376]

There are very few relative clauses that begin other
than with *ša*. In one, *mīnum-mê* functions as a general re-
lative pronoun:[377] *mīnum-mê ardū ša RN lū ardu lū amtu ina*

---

[374]It must be pointed out, however, that no certain
bīt īpušu constructions occur otherwise in K, although there
may be one in 5:103:6ff.; see above, p. 88, and n. 222.
Although the subjunctive usually appears where expected in
the legal texts, there are number of instances where it is
lacking; see above, pp. 61f.

[375]For this meaning of *šalāmu*, with inanimate subject,
see *AHw*, 1144a (*šalāmu* G 3).

[376]On the occurrence or lack of the subjunctive in K,
see above, pp. 60ff.

[377]Cf. the similar use of *mimma* in native Akk.; noted
in *GAG* §168d.

GN ašbū-mi "Whatever servants of RN, whether male or female, live in GN" 4:163:21'f. But in two other examples, one almost exactly the same as the last, *mīnum-mê* plus a noun phrase serve as antecedent to *ša*: ibid.:26'f.; 4:188:8ff., both quoted above, p. 39.

Two other relative clauses without *ša* (both *bīt īpušu* constructions) have been proposed in preceding sections: *kī magî-mê n[arkabā]t šamšu iqtab[û]* "however many chariots the Sun has commanded" 5:103:6f. (see above, p. 88, and n. 222); and *u X kasap PN ilteqe šalim* "then the X silver PN took is clear (paid)" 4:177:24f. (see pp. 133f.).

In relative clauses with *ša*, the determinative pronoun may occur without an antecedent; the resulting noun clause may be the object of a verb: e.g., *šumma ša idūkūšu iṣab-batū* "if they catch the one who killed him" 4:153:7f., cf. 13f. No examples occur in which the clause is the subject of a verb, undoubtedly by coincidence. In the following, the relative clause is the predicate of a nominal sentence: *ša kaspi ša PN šū* "it is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN's silver" 4:177:19f.

Most often, there is an antecedent, which *ša* follows immediately:[378] eg., *ša tamkāri šâšu ša ina GN dīku* "of that trader, who was murdered in GN" 4:170:13f.; etc. In one instance, however, the relative clause is separated from its

---

[378]That is, it follows the antecedent with and all its other modifiers; see above, pp. 104f.

antecedent noun by an adverbial predicate, presumably for the sake of greater clarity: *aššum dīni sinništi ša mutši itti PN ša ina GN idūkū* "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was with PN, who (referring to the husband[379]) was murdered in GN" 5:95:40ff.

The relative clause may be verbal, as in *ša aqbû*[380] "which I said" 4:55:18, or nominal, as in *ša itti arad PN* "who is with PN's servant 5:94:6. In two cases of the latter type, in which the predicates are prepositional phrases, the preposition has been deleted after *ša*: *kaspu [š]a*[381] *muhhīšu* "the silver which he owes" 5:94:11; *ša libbi GN ašbū* "who live in GN" 4:163:26'. There are no prepositional phrases modifying nouns in K (e.g., "the book on the table");[382] all such relationships are expressed by nominal

---

[379]It is clear from the rest of the context that the woman's husband was killed; however, it is also clear that PN too was killed. Thus, it is possible that the relative clause refers to PN, in which case it conforms to normal grammar in coming directly after its antecedent. Another possibility is that the second *ša* is otiose, and that the lines quoted mean: "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was murdered along with PN in GN." This is Nougayrol's interpretation ("dont on a tué le mari à [GN] avec [PN]"). Note, however, that there are no other instances of otiose *ša* in K (it does occur in U; see below, p. 335).

[380]The past tense in relative clauses is usually expressed by the pret.; however, the perf. does occur occasionally; see below, pp. 142f.

[381]For this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202.

[382]Such constructions are common in U legal texts; see below, p. 334. In K, even *kirî karānīya ina GN ittaksū-mi* 5:95:36f. is probably not "My orchard (which is) in GN they tore down," but rather "In GN, they tore down my orchard" (i.e., the prepositional phrase modifies the verb).

relative clauses, such as the three just cited (i.e., "the book which is on the table").

The relative pronoun may represent the subject of its clause: e.g., *ša hepû* "which was broken" 4:177:18; or the direct object: e.g., *ša ihpû* "which he broke" ibid.:15. Presumably, when it represented the direct object, it could be resumed by a pronominal suffix on the verb, as is possible even in main clauses;[383] however, no examples occur. When *ša* represents a noun whose relationship to the subordinate verb is other than subject or object, it must, as is normal in Akk., still stand first, and be resumed by a pronoun elsewhere in the clause;[384] that is, it may not be governed by a preposition. Only one such example is attested: *sinništi ša mutši itti PN* "of the woman whose husband was with PN" 5:95:40f.

There are no instances in which *ša* governs more than one clause. In the only case where such an opportunity arises, *ša* is (probably) repeated: *ša ištu [kakkīš]u(?) ileqqû u [ša] ina mātīšu...irrubû* "those whom he takes with(?) his weapons(?), and who enter his land..." 4:54:9ff.

No examples occur in K in which *ša* means "that," i.e., introduces a clause as object of a verb of knowing, speaking, etc.[385]

---

[383]Resumptive pronouns are discussed below, pp. 158f.

[384]*GAG* §165c.

[385]Cf. *GAG* §177d.

c. Other Subordinate Clauses.[386]

These are rare in K;[387] they seem to be so uncommon with respect to native Akk., that one wonders whether some substrate influence is at work, from a dialect (WS?) that preferred "logical" or "undifferentiated" subordination, by means of coordination, to grammatical subordination.[388]

In all the examples, the subordinate clause precedes the main clause. Of seven instances where the texts is not broken, the main clause is introduced by *u* four times (three in the letters):[389] e.g., *u kīmê iqta[bû] mā...u ittahna[q]* "and when they said..., he hanged himself" *5:109:8ff.; without *u*: *kī ša ahhūšunu iqabbûni akanna ušallamūni* "According as their brothers say, so they will repay" 4:155f.: 10f.,32f.

The subordinate clauses found in K may be grouped into two general types: temporal and comparative. One example of each was quoted in the preceding paragraph. For the latter type, note also: *u kī mullâ mārū GN ana PN umtallû u ana sinništi š[aši] mullâ an[a muttši(?) ...*[390] "then

---

---

just as the citizens of GN paid a fine for PN, (they will

pay?) that woman a fine for her husband(?)" 5:95:53ff.

There seems to be no difference in meaning between $k\bar{\imath}$ and

$k\bar{\imath}$ $\check{s}a$.[391] Note that $k\bar{\imath}$ ($\check{s}a$) is used both times in clauses

of comparison, whereas $k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$ introduces a temporal clause.[392]

These examples are too few, however, to conclude that this

was a general rule in K, an unlikely situation considering

the ranges of use that both exhibit elsewhere.[393]

Another temporal clause is: $\check{s}umma...l\bar{a}m$ $an\bar{a}ku$ ina GN

$eqerrebu$ $atta$ RN $tahabbat!-ma$[394] "if...before I approach

GN, you, RN, advance..." 4:54:3ff.[395]

The originally Hurrian adverb $undu$[396] appears to be

used as a temporal conjunction, meaning "when," in its two

---

form, and in any case, it does not fit the traces as well
as well as Nougayrol's proposed $\acute{u}$ɔ(?)-ɾaɔl(?)-ɾlaɔ(?)-aɾ.
The general sense is clear, at least, regardless of the
reading.

[391]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 154; *GAG* §178f.

[392]$k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$ occurs one other time, in a broken passage: u
$k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$ $nukurtu$ $\check{s}a$ GN ɾ$iggammar(u)$ɔ "and when the war with GN
is finished" 4:151:11. Again, $k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$ has a temporal meaning.

[393]Cf., e.g., *AHw*, 469 ($k\bar{\imath}$ C), 478a ($k\bar{\imath}m\hat{e}$). Note that
the latter occurs only in peripheral Akk. For enclitic -$m\hat{e}$,
see above, pp. 87ff.

[394]The text has ah-ta-ba-at-mɾaɔ; cf. p. 63, n. 155.

[395]Cf. also, in **4:197:14f.: adi ɾa$\check{s}r\bar{a}nu$(?)ɔ $a\check{s}ib$
ɾ(u) $k\bar{\imath}$ɔ $\mathfrak{t}\bar{a}bi(\check{s})$ $dugul\check{s}u$ "As long as he remains there(?),
regard him well." In the copy, there is enough room for
$\grave{u}$ ki-i, but Nougayrol restores only ki-i.

[396]Cf. E.A. Speiser, *Introduction to Hurrian*, *AASOR*
XX (New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941),
89f.; Bush, "Hurrian," 240f.

occurrences in K.[397] In both cases, the main clause is
introduced by *u*; in the first, the verb has the ventive
ending: *undu mār šiprīka aššum arad PN₁ tašpura u hub[a-
n]ānu(?) ša PN₂ u PN₁...iptaṭaršu* "When you sent me your
messenger concerning PN₁'s servant, the ...(?) of PN₂ and
PN₁...ransomed him" 3:7:5ff.; in the second text, 4:54f.,
the verb lacks the subjunctive *-u*, even though it occurs
elsewhere in the text where expected (*ll*.6,18): *undu šar
GN ittīya ikkir u ana RN akanna altapar* "When the king of
GN was at war with me, I wrote to RN as follows" *ll*.1ff.
In both of these passages, it would be possible to consider
undu an introductory adverb, "now then," or the like, as it
is in Hurrian: "Now then you sent..., and"; "Now then...was
at war..., and." However, its use elsewhere in Akk. would
argue against this interpretation.[398]

     A similar situation is encountered with *enūma*, which
occurs five times in K, always in the letters.[399] It some-
times occurs in simple sentences: e.g., *enūma PN imtahranni
ma ... "...PN approached me (saying:)..." 5:95:35f. In

----

[397]*undu* occurs almost exclusively in WPA. It is ap-
parently a conjunction in the material from Boghazkoy (see
Labat, *AkkBo*, 226); from Nuzi (Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 229); from
Amarna (*EA* II, 1425, 1539--texts from Assyria, Boghazkoy,
Mittanni, Byblos, Beirut). For examples in U, see below,
pp. 337f.

     [398]See the previous note.

     [399]3:3:6; 3:8:25; 4:193:5; 5:95:35; *5:90:6; cf. also
**4:196:8. Rather than Nougayrol's [*e-nu-ma*] at the begin-
ning of 4:151:13, [ù] should probably be restored.

compound sentences, the second clause is always introduced
by *u*, and *enūma* is never followed by the subjunctive.[400]
These facts point to the conclusion that *enūma* is not a con-
junction in K, but rather a sentence-initial adverb, meaning
something like "now then."[401]   Other examples are: *enūma*
haptīr[ū] ittīya ul ašbū u anumma PN ātabak-ma ittalak "Now
then, the Hapiru are not living with me; and I have just
sent PN off, and he has gone" 3:3:6ff.; *enūma PN ašrānu...*
illaka u atta ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tēteneppuššu "Now
then, PN is coming there..., and you must treat him well,
according to his rank" 4:193:6ff.

     For action in the past in subordinate clauses, it seems
that either the pret. or the perf. could be used (see the
examples); no difference in nuance is discernible.   For
incompleted action (either present or future time), the
dur. is of course employed.[402]

     No subordinate Clauses with negatives occur.

10. *The Use of the Tenses*

a. Preterite and Perfect.

     In MB letters, according to Aro, the pret. is used to
express action in the past only in subordinate clauses, and

---

     [400]It must be pointed out, however, that in the letters,
the subjunctive is not common; see above, p. 60.

     [401]Cf. *CAD* I/J, 158b; *AHw*, 384a (*inūma* C).

     [402]On the use of the tenses in general, see the next
section.

negated and interrogative main clauses, while in positive assertions, the perf. is used.[403] In legal texts and *kudurru*'s, on the other hand, the pret. is the regular form for the past in all circumstances. In all the text types, finally, there are numerous exceptions to these generalizations.

In the K texts, a situation quite similar to MB exists, although a few differences do present themselves. We will examine the range of occurrences of the two forms separately, for greater clarity. But first, it should be noted that both forms are used only for completed action in the past.

The pret. is the normal tense in relative clauses, occurring 15 out of 20 times for past action.[404] Thus, e.g., while *nadānu* in main clauses is always in the perf. for past action (over ten times[405]), in the only relative clause in which it occurs, it is pret.: *ša ana šīmi iddinū* "which they gave for a price" 4:161:30'. Similarly, *epēšu* occurs four times in the perf., always in main clauses;[406] but in a relative clause: *ša ina libbi GN mārat RN...ēpušu* "which

---

[403]*SMbG*, 80ff.; cf. *GAG* §§79,80.

[404]With the pret.: 3:3f.:6,11; 3:6:8; 3:8:24; 4:55:18; 4:127:9f.; 4:162f.:2'f.,3'f.,10',30'; 4:176:15; 5:94f.:7,43; 5:103:5,10; note that nine of these are *ša tašpura*. With the perf.: 4:192:12ff.; 4:209:5f.; 5:95:49; also, if the unmarked relative clauses proposed above (see p. 135) are correct, 4:177:24; 5:103:6ff. *i-du-ku(-šu)* in 4:153:7,13; 5:95:42 could be either pret. or perf.

[405]E.g., 4:167:9,17; 4:168:12; 5:94:15.

[406]4:176:8,11; *5:90:11; *5:109:13.

the daughter of RN...acquired in GN" 4:127:9f. The same
may be noted for a number of other verbs as well.[407] The
instances in which the perf. occurs in relative clauses
must simply be labelled exceptions to the general rule.

Another circumstance in which the pret. is found regu-
larly is the first clauses of many of the legal dockets. In
very general terms, a K legal text has the following format
(there are many variations, deletions of clauses, and so on):

ana panī RN (± genealogy)	In the presence of RN...;
PN₁ u/itti PN₂ ana dīni *išniqū*[408]	PN₁ and PN₂ approached for a judgment;
PN₁ iqbi (plus quote)[409]	PN₁ said...;
(PN₂ iqbi (plus quote))[409]	(PN₂ said...);
further statements, *pret.*	further evidence;
šarru akanna iprus, plus injunction(s)	The king decided as follows:...;
(inanna) one or more clauses, verb(s) *perf.*, describing action taken due to king's decision	(now)...result(s) of decision;
ina arki ūmi...	prohibitions and condi- tions regarding fu- ture litigation.

---

[407]E.g., *šakānu*: always perf. in main clauses (e.g.,
5:94:14; 4:179:10), but twice pret. in relative clauses (3:
7:17; 4:188:10; but once perf.: 4:192:14); *nakāsu*: *ittak-
sū-mi* 5:95:37; 4:162:7'(main clauses), but *ša...ikkisū* 4:
162:10' (the pret. *nakkis*, also occurs in an oath, after
šumma 4:162:9',12'); *hepū*: *ahtapi* 4:177:13, but *ša ihpū*
ibid.:15.

[408]On the sibilant in s/*šanāqu*, see above, p. 28. The
meaning "to go (to court)" is attested for *sanāqu* already

As an example of this format, 4:172f. is here quoted in full:

ana panī RN	In the presence of RN,
PN u amīlū GN ana dīni išniqū	PN and the men of GN came to court.
PN akanna iqbi mā tamkārū ša qātīya ina GN dīkū-mi	PN said as follows: "Traders in my charge were murdered in GN."
u šarru dīnšunu akanna iprus mā PN litma-mi	The king decided as follows: "Let PN swear,
u amīlū GN mullâ ša tamkārī ana PN limallû-mi	and let the men of GN pay the fine for the traders to PN."
*PN u amīlū ina birīšunu imtagrū*410	PN and the men of GN (have) agreed among themselves,
u PN ištu māmīti utterrū	and they (have) allowed PN to refrain from the oath.
amīlū GN 1200 šiqil kaspa ana PN umtellû	The men of GN (have) paid 1200 shekels of silver to PN.
ina arki ūmi RN aššum tamkārī ana muhhi amīlī GN lā iraggum	In future, PN may not contest concerning the fine for the traders against the men of GN,
u amīlū GN aššum 1200 kaspi ana muhhi PN lā [iraggum]ū	and the men of GN may not contest concerning the 1200 silver against PN.
ša iraggum tuppu annû ile''ēšu	This tablet will defeat whoever contests.

in OB *ana dayyānī i nisniq* (cited in AHw, 1021a - *sanāqu* G B 3). Once, in K, instead of *sanāqu*, *ṣabātu* occurs, but still in the pret.: *ana panī PN₁ mār šarri PN₂...PN₃ iṣbat mā...* "In the presence of PN₁, the king's son, PN₂...seized PN₃..., (saying)..." *4:189:1ff.; for *ṣabātu* in this type of context, cf. CAD Ṣ, 14f. (*ṣabātu* 2 d).

409Or other verbs having to do with presenting evidence: e.g, *šūlû*: *PN akanna iqbi mā...[u] PN unūtēšu mimma...ul*

Essentially then, the background of the case (i.e., the coming to court of the litigants, the presentation of the evidence, and the notice that the king made a decision) is presented in clauses in which the verbs are pret. The result, or outcome, of the case consists of a clause or clauses with verb(s) in the perf. Whether these latter should therefore be considered to connote "present relevance," and so require an English present perfect in translation, or whether we are simply dealing with a stylistic device, is probably a moot point; the perf., as will be noted below, is elsewhere in K, the norm for simple past action.

As mentioned above, many variations and deletions occur in the various texts. But these are for the most part abbreviations, and the observations made hold good almost without exception. Thus, e.g., in 6:37, *išniqū* is followed by two quotes which are introduced by clauses with *iqbi*; these complete the first part of the text. The next clause has the verb in the perf.: *šarru...[ana] māmīti ittadin* "The king (has) placed...under oath" *ll*.10ff.; this relates

---

ušēli "PN said as follows..., but PN did not produce any of the vessels..." 4:170:4ff.

[410]This is most likely a Gt pret. (so *AHw*, 576a); however, a Gt perf. should not be expected, since no forms with double infixed *t* (e.g., *imtatgurū*) occur anywhere in the texts found at Ras Shamra. (They do occur elsewhere in WPA, e.g., in the Amarna letters from Mittanni, but there they are perf.'s of the iterative stems: e.g., *tartata''am* - *rāmu* "to love," Gtn - *EA* 17:11; *ūtetetter* - *(w)atāru* "to exceed," Dtn - *EA* 29:40.)

part of the outcome of the case. Text 4:178a contains the
heading (*ana panī...*) and the *išniqū* clause; but the text
then omits the rest of the preamble, and the next clauses
report the outcome of the hearing, again with verbs in the
perf.: *PN₁ PN₂ ištu dīni iltešu u šarru...iltakan sākinnu
...ittadin* "PN₁ (has) defeated PN₂ in the suit, and the king
(has) imposed...; the prefect (has) given..." *ll.*4ff. A
number of texts abbreviate even more, giving only the head-
ing, and then jumping immediately to the judgment in, or
results of, the case, so that the pret. does not appear at
all: e.g., *ana panī RN₁ šar GN₁...PN₁ u PN₂ itti RN₂ šar
GN₂ hītata ihtaṭû FN ummašunu...tittadin u...tultellišunuti
u...taltakan* "In the presence of RN₁, king of GN₁...: PN₁
and PN₂ (have) committed a crime against RN₂ king of GN₂;
and FN their mother (has) given..., and (has) sent them
away..., and (has) imposed..." 4:121f.:1ff.

The use of the pret. for the background of legal cases
may underly its occurrence in a number of unexpected places,
especially in the letters: e.g., *ina hūd libbīšunu akanna
aprⁿuⁿs u ana PN akanna aqbi...u PN akanna iqbi* "With their
agreement, I decided as follows, and said to PN as follows
...and PN said as follows" 3:7f.:11ff. The context and
words here are quasi-legal in nature, and so the pret. is
used.[411] The outcome of this "case," the next main clause,

---

[411]Cf. also 5:94:7ff. It is noteworthy that *qabû* makes
up many of the instances of pret. for expected perf. that
Aro observes in MB; see idem, *SMbG*, 84ff.

has the verb in the perf.: *u PN napšat(a)ya ittⁱamⁱi* "And (so) PN has sworn by my life" *l*.22.

Finally, the pret. is also used to express the past tense in the treaties. In fact, the perf. does not appear in those texts at all.

Thus, the use of the pret. in K is to a great extent in agreement with that found in MB. In both, the pret. is preferred in the legal or state texts,[412] while in letters, its use is restricted to certain types of clauses. In the latter, however, there are significant differences between MB and K: in native MB letters, the pret. occurs in interrogative sentences, with negatives, and in all types of subordinate clauses,[413] while in the K letters, it appears regularly only in relative clauses. In other subordinate clauses with action in the past, two have pret.'s, but two others have perf.'s.[414] With negatives, the verb is pret. only once,[415] but perf. four times.[416] Finally, in the

---

[412]Except for the clauses expressing the actions resulting from judgments in legal cases, as noted above.

[413]Aro, *SMbG*, 81. The perf. is used in MB in temporal clauses as a future perfect, the verb of the main clause being dur. or prec.; cf. ibid.; 148f, 151. No such examples occur in K.

[414]With the pret.: 3:7:5f.; 4:54:1f.; with the perf. 5:95:53f.; *5:109:8; these are all quoted above, pp. 138ff.

[415]4:170:9; on *lā itūr(a)* in *4:189:19,20, see the last paragraph in this section.

[416]4:167:10; 6:36:10; 6:37:9,14.

only question in K, the verb is perf.[417] It would seem,
then, that in all of these situations (except for relative
clauses), the choice between pret. and perf. was arbitrary,
but that the latter was preferred.

In the letters, the normal form for past tense in *main*
clauses is the perf.: e.g., *enūma PN imtahranni mā kirî
karānīya ina GN ittaksū-mi* "Now then PN approached me (say-
ing): 'they tore down my vineyard in GN' " 5:95:35ff.; *šar
GN pāṭīya ilteqē-mi [u ā]la ištēn ilteqē-mi* "The king of
GN took territories of mine, and one city" *5:90:9f. In
these, and in most other examples, the question of "present
relevance" is again moot, since the occurrence of the perf.
is syntactically determined; that is, the pret. simply does
not normally occur in such situations. With *anumma*, how-
ever, the immediate past probably *is* implied, the best trans-
lation being the present perfect, or even the present:
anumma middata...ultēbilakku "I hereby send you the measure-
ment..." 4:194:6ff.; note also: *u anumma PN₁ u PN₂ altap-
ra[kku]*[418] "I am hereby sending to you PN₁ and PN₂" 4:188:
15ff., for which the duplicate text, 3:6f., has a dur. in-
stead: *anumma PN₁ itti PN₂ illakūnikku* "Now then PN₁ and
PN₂ are coming to you" *ll*.19ff.

To summarize, then, the perf. in K is the normal form
for past action in main clauses in letters and the clauses

417...]î *akanna tētep[uš*] "Why/How did you act thus?"
*5:90:11. For the lacuna, see above, 85, under *kîkî*.

418For this restoration, see above, p. 56, n. 128.

in legal texts which express the outcome of a case. It
also occurs more often than the pret. in subordinate (ex-
cept relative) clauses,[419] questions, and negated clauses.
The pret. is normal in treaty texts, in the first part of
legal texts, and in relative clauses in all text types.

There are of course exceptional instances of both
forms in conditions in which they do not usually occur.
This is true in MB as well,[420] and it can only be suggested
that the rules that have been noted were not hard and fast,
but rather simply the norm. Thus, a pret. in the latter
part of a legal text, after a perf. in a previous clause,
cannot really be explained: *inanna PN ittama u mārū GN...
ušallimū* "Now, PN swore (has sworn), and the citizens of
GN (have) paid..." 4:170:15ff.;[421] or in a letter, after
anumma: *anumma ištu ekalli išpurūnikku* "They hereby send
(or: now then, they sent) to you from the palace" 3:6:9f.
The perf. occurs once in the "evidence" section of a legal
text: *PN ana panī šarri ittaraṣ* "PN admitted before the
king" 4:179:7; for the perf. in a few relative clauses,
see above p. 142, n. 404. The exceptions should not, how-
ever, obscure the facts, that the pret. and perf. had for

---

[419]In the only protasis of a conditional sentence in
which the action is past, the perf. is used (3:8:28f., see
above, p. 132).

[420]Aro, *SMbG*, 83ff.

[421]Cf. also 4:166:4,6, where *itmā-mi* occurs twice,
after *šarru...iprus*.

the most part mutually exclusive ranges of use in K, and
that the scribes were fairly consistent in this regard.

Only once does the use of a tense appear to be the
result of substrate influence, namely, the use of a pret.
in a prohibition in *4:189:19,20, quoted above, pp. 57f.
Quite probably this use of the pret. reflects WS *yaqtul(a)*
(jussive).[422]

b. Durative.

The use of the dur. in K generally conforms to that
seen elsewhere in Akk.[423] It expresses action that is in-
complete, and its tense value in assertions must be derived
from its context. The action may take place in the future:
e.g., *ina šērti umaššarūka* "In the morning[424] they will re-
lease you" 5:109:9f.; also, in the apodosis of most condi-
tional sentences: e.g., *tuppu annû ile''ēšu* "this tablet
will defeat him" *AnOr*48:12:23f., etc. With present tense
value, note: *anumma PN...illakakku* "Now then, PN...is com-
ing to you" 4:192:6ff. The dur. may also describe action
in the past: e.g., action occurring over a period of time
(i.e., which describes circumstantial activity): *dunnāti
ša šar GN₁ ša FN...ukallu ina[nn]a šar GN₂ ana RN šar GN₁*

---

[422]This phenomenon is much more common in the U texts;
see below, p. 346.

[423]Cf. *GAG* §78; Aro, *SMbG*, 80.

[424]The suggestion of P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 287, "man er-
lässt dir die Strafe," seems less felicitous.

uttēr "The fortified estates of the king of GN₁ which FN...
held, the king of GN₂ has now returned to RN king of GN₁"
4:208:2ff.;[425] habitual action, often in the Gtn: e.g.,
šar GN harrāni ša tamkārī [il]tanarriq-mi "The king of GN
kept stealing the traders' caravans" 4:176:5f. One verb
by its very nature occurs in the dur. for past action: *PN
ana tummî lā imangur* "PN would not agree to taking an oath"
4:163:18.[426]

Because it expresses non-punctual action, it is the
natural form to be used in purpose clauses: *u anumma PN₁
altapra[kku] u pāṭī šašunu-[m]a išakkanūnikku* "And I hereby
send to you PN₁ and PN₂ to (re-)establish those very borders
for you" 4:188:15ff.

The dur. is also the normal form for prohibitions
(negative commands):[427] e.g., *mamma lū lā unakkaršunūtī-mi*
"No one may alter them" 3:7:17f.; *lā iraggum* "may not con-
test" 4:167:23,25, and p.; *ina pāṭānī[šu lū(?)] lā teqerreb*
"Do not/You may not approach his borders" *5:91:14f.

In conjunction with the particle *lū,*[428] the dur. be-
comes a (polite?) injunctive in *kī ṭābiš lū tēteneppuššu*

---

[425]Note also *ša idabbubu* "about which he was speaking"
4:176f.:11,16,22.

[426]Cf. also 6:37:14 (*lā imagg[ur]*).

[427]Cf. *GAG* §81h. For an apparent pret. in a prohibi-
tion (*4:189:19,20), see above, pp. 57f.

[428]Cf. *GAG* §81e; OB examples are cited in the *Ergäns-
ungsheft* to §81e. For *lū* in general in K, see above, 112f.

"You should treat him well" 4:193:11f.,24f.[429]

The only use of the dur.--and this is its most frequent use in K--that deviates from native Akk., is its occurrence, without exception, in verbal protases of conditional sentences, where the action conjectured is future. Examples are quoted above, pp. 129ff. In normal MB, the perf. is usually employed.[430]

In one instance, the dur. appears in a purpose clause after an imper., where normal Akk. would probably have a prec.: *šūšir u šamši minūta eppaš* "prepare...so that my Sun may take a count" 4:192:15f.[431]

c. Imperative and Precative.[432]

These show no unusual features in their use. It was noted above (p. 132), that in the apodoses of conditional sentences, the prec. is apparently often interchangeable with the dur. An instance of the dur. for the prec. in a purpose clause was cited above. More normal Akk. usage occurs, e.g., in *PN lutammâm-mi akanna liqbi* "Let me adjure PN to say as follows" 3:7f.:14ff.

_____

[429]In **4:196:7, the dur. is used, without *lū*, with the force of an imper.: *ṭēma tišappara* "Send me news." This clause is discussed in more detail above, pp. 51f., n. 114.

[430]Aro, *SMbG*, 144f.

[431]See above, pp. 122f.

[432]Cf. *GAG* §81a-d; Aro, *SMbG*, 86f.

d. Stative.[433]

The stative too offers few problems of interpretation; its use is for the most part lexically or semantically determined, rather than syntactically. Thus, e.g., the verb *ašābu*, "to dwell," always (five times[434]) appears in the stative when finite,[435] as in *enūma haptrū ittīya ul ašbū* "Now then, the Hapiru are not dwelling with me" 3:3:6f.

Statives of active-transitive verbs are usually passive: *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū ṣabtū* "It is in their (present) place that they must be kept" 3:7:15f.; *tuppa kanku ša hepû* "the sealed tablet which was broken" 4:177:18. The only active statives are from the verb *hubbulu* "to borrow." Normally, the stative of this verb, through an unusual transformation, means "to be indebted, to owe," with a person as subject, and an amount as object.[436] This construction occurs in one K text: *300 kaspa habbulātā-mi...mimmāa lāa habbulāku-mi* "You owe 300 silver...I owe nothing" *4:189:5ff. The *expected* passive transformation of this verb should have resulted in the thing borrowed becoming the

---

[433]On the treatment of the stative in this study, see above, 12ff. See also the more detailed discussion of the stative forms in U, below, pp. 355ff.

[434]3:3f.:7,11; 4:163:22',26'; 6:37:10; cf. also **4:197:17.

[435]The infinitive occurs in 4:193:8; the Š, of course, occurs as a fientic verb (e.g., *ultēšibši AnOr*48:12:12.

[436]Cf. *CAD* H, 6f.; *AHw*, 302; M.B. Rowton, "The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian," *JNES* 21 (1962), 268 (no. 242).

the subject, but this is not the case in any of the examples
in the dictionaries. It does occur, however, in another K
text: *800 kaspa ša PN, ša ana muhhīya hubbul ana PN ultal-
lim-mi* "I paid the 800 silver of PN that was owed by (lit.:
charged against) me" 5:94:18ff. It may also occur earlier
in the same text: *400 KÙ.BABBAR ana muhhi PN$_1$ u ana muhhi
PN$_2$ [a]n[āk]u(??)*[437] *hubbul-mi* ibid.:8ff. Unfortunately,
the case of KÙ.BABBAR is not marked. Nougayrol translates:
"J'avais une créance de 400 (sicles d')argent sur [PN$_1$] et
(une autre) à la charge de [PN$_2$]" This is possible only if
the scribe was ignorant of the morphology of the stative,
for *hubbulāku* is expected; cf. *4:189:8, cited above. Per-
haps this was in fact the case, since, interestingly, the
forms in *4:189:6,8 are the only statives in K that are not
third person. Yet none of the other forms is incorrect,
and the occurrence of the 2ms and 1s in *4:189 suggests
that the scribes did understand the formation of the sta-
tive. Thus (to get back to the original point), it is pos-
sible that the sentence in 5:94:8ff. should be rendered
like the one in *ll.*18ff.: "400 silver (*kaspu,* nom.) was
owed to me(??) by (lit.: against) PN$_1$ and PN$_2$." If *anāku*
is in fact the word in the break, this proposal would also
indicate scribal ignorance--but in this case, of the con-
struction of the expression itself, for an independent nom.
pronoun is certainly out of place as an indirect object.

---

[437]The copy has ▨▨▨▨▨.

The stative has no specific tense value (or, connotes no specific aspect). The examples cited above show that it could represent past and present action; the lack of an example with future sense is fortuitous. To express a will toward a state, i.e., the jussive of the stative, the particle *lū* is used.[438] For examples, see above, p. 112.

11. *The Construction of the Infinitive*

Infinitives occur only rarely in K. Two of the examples are very similar: *PN ana tummî ul imangur* 4:167:18; *PN [ana t]ummîšu lā imagg[ur]*6:37:14. Both mean, freely, "PN would not agree to take an oath." However, it is the G of *tamû* that means "to swear, take an oath"; the D is causative, "to adjure, cause to swear."[439] Thus, the D infinitives here are passive in voice, a rather uncommon phenomenon, but not an unknown one;[440] a literal translation would be: "PN would not agree to (his) being adjured." *magāru* is often construed with *ana* plus an infinitive.[441]

An infinitive in a genitive absolute construction (i. e., without a preposition) occurs in *enūma PN₁ ašrānu itti PN₂ ašābi illaka* "Now then, PN₁ is coming there to live with

---

[438]Cf. *GAG* §81b.

[439]*AHw*, 1317f.

[440]Cf. *GAG* §85b; J. Aro, *Die akkadischen Infinitiv-konstruktionen, Studia Orientalia* 26 (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1961), 297f.

[441]Cf. *AHw*, 575b (*magāru* G II 2 b); Aro, *Infinitiv-konstruktionen*, 121.

PN₂" 4:193:6ff. *itti* here governs only the following PN, not the infinitive; the expected construction is *itti PN ana aṣābi*.[442] However, genitive infinitives without prepositions occur elsewhere, and Aro notes that they usually connote purpose ("finalen Sinn"),[443] as the present example obviously does.

One other infinitive may occur, in 4:176:3f.: *PN 4000 kaspa ana ha-ma-ŠI ilteqē-mi* "PN has taken 4000 silver ..." Nougayrol translates *ha-ma-ši* "frauduleusement(?)," but offers no support for this, and no verb *hamāšu* fits this rendering.[444] Perhaps it should be emended to *ha-la!-li*,[445] the genitive of *halālu*, "to creep, slink, steal."[446] The phrase *ana halāli* would then mean "in stealth." Von Soden makes an equally plausible suggestion, to read *ana ha-ba!-li* "by force."[447]

---

[442]*ana* plus infinitive is a very common means of expressing purpose in Akk.; cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 119ff. (with *alāku*, p. 119); see also idem, *SMbG*, 127ff. (*alāku*, 131.)

[443]Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 69ff. All of Aro's examples of this construction are OB or SB. However, note the following from Boghazkoy: *šumma mithuẓi tallaka* "if you are coming to fight" *KBo* 1:3:38f., alongside *ana mithuẓi ana pantya ittalkū* "they have come before me to fight" *KBo* 1:2:23 (both cited in *CAD* A/1, 307a).

[444]Cf. *CAD* H, 60f.; *AHw*, 315f.

[445]*LIM* elsewhere in K occurs word-finally only as a phonetic complement to logograms; see above, p. 27, n. 38.

[446]*CAD* H, 33b (*halālu* A).

[447]*AHw*, 301b (*habālu* I 1). In either case, the preposition *ana* is peculiar; *ina* is expected; cf. *ina emū[qi]* "by force" 6:36:5.

12. *The Syntax of the Accusative Case*

a. General.

There is no occurrence in K of a verb with a double acc.[448] While this may be purely coincidental, it is nevertheless quite remarkable.

The acc. is occasionally used adverbially, i.e., to replace a prepositional phrase.[449] An acc. of place ("where") is: *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū ṣabtū* "it is in their (present) place that they must be maintained" 3:7:15f.; cf. 4:188:11f. (for *ina ašrīšunū-mā-mi*). The frequent adverbial expression *urram šēram*[450] "in future" consists of two nouns in acc. of time ("when"). Both *gabbu* and *mimma* occur as acc.'s of respect, meaning "entirely" and "(not) at all" respectively. For examples, see above, pp. 38, 41f. In two instances, prepositions are deleted after *ša*,[451] in effect leaving the following nouns as acc.'s of place: *ša libbi GN ašbū* "who live in GN" 4:163:26' (cf. *l*.22', with *ina GN*); *kaspu* [*š*]*a muhhīšu*[452] "silver owed by him" 5:94: 10f. Finally, the acc. even replaces a prepositional phrase with *aššum*: compare *kaspa ša 400 imērī ša idabbubu PN litma*

448On the D and š conjugations in particular, see above, pp. 64ff., and especially nn. 157, 162.

449Cf. *GAG* §§146,147.

450Cf. *PRU* 3, 230, s.v.

451Cf. *GAG* §115c.

452On this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202

"let PN swear concerning the silver of the 400 asses, about which he was speaking" 4:177:22f., and *u mārū GN aššum* NÌ. GU₄.MEŠ-*šu-nu aššum unūtēšunu itammûni* "The citizens of GN will swear concerning their possesions(?) and their vessels" 4:155:14ff.[453]

b. The Resumptive Accusative Suffix.

In a few instances, the direct object of a sentence is resumed by an acc. pronominal suffix on the verb.[454] This feature is not found in any relative clauses,[455] but rather only in main clauses. The object to which the suffix refers invariably precedes its verb, and is always a person or persons.[456] Sometimes, it is probable that a resumptive pronoun is employed because the object is greatly separated from the verb: e.g., *u šarru PN aššum X kaspi u unūte siparri*...(etc., for six lines)...*ana māmīti ittadinšu* "And the king placed PN under oath concerning the X silver,

---

[453]Usually, the acc. with *tamû* indicates what the oath is sworn by: e.g., *PN napšata ša šarri litmā-mi* "Let PN swear by the king's life" 3:8:20f. (cf. *l*.22); cf. *AHw*, 1317b (*tamû* G I). For "to swear an oath" in K, note: *ina māmīti itammûni* 4:156f.:22,40. Note that our interpretation of 4:177:22f. above differs from Nougayrol's; see above, p. 133, and n. 373.

[454]4:151:10; 4:167:17; 4:178:5; *AnOr*48:11f.:8,11; probably also 3:8:26 (see n. 456, below); possibly *5:109:16. Cf. also the last paragraph in this section, and note **4: 196:9.

[455]Cf. e.g., *amīlī...ša iddinū* "men whom they sell..." 4:163:30'.

[456]A probable example with a pl. is *amīlī annûti ana ṭemmi attašīšunu(?)* "I brought these men to agreement" 3:8:25f.

the vessels of copper, etc." 4:167:10ff. But the suffix
occurs in short sentences as well: *PN₁ PN₂ ištu dīni iltêšu*
PN₁ defeated PN₂ in court" 4:178:4f. It is doubtful that
any particular emphasis is placed on the object because of
the suffix, since the word order of the sentence is never
altered.[457] It should be repeated that this feature is
not common in K; normally, there is no resumptive suffix.[458]

It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine whe-
ther the following common sentence should be included here,
or whether the direct object, a relative clause that stands
at the head of the sentence, should be considered a casus
pendens: *ša iraggum tuppu annû ile''ešu*[459] "This tablet
will defeat whoever contests" 4:179:16f.; 6:36:r4', and
often.

13. *Incomplete and Interrupted Grammar*

a. Ellipsis.

Ellipsis occurs a few times in the letters. Once, an
object is omitted:[460] *libbašu ša šamši mimma lū lā imalla*

---

[457]I.e., these are not to be considered examples of
casus pendens (cf. *GAG* §128); note that wherever the case
can be determined in these examples, it is acc. For true
casus pendens, see below, pp. 162f.

[458]E.g., *u PN ištu māmîti utterrū* "They allowed PN to
refrain from (taking) an oath" 4:172:10f.; *šar GN₁ [RN šar]
GN₂ [...] umteššer* "The king of GN₁ has released RN the
king of GN₂..." 4:150:3ff.; etc.

[459]This of course represents *tuppu annû ša iraggum
ile''e.

[460]Cf. *GAG* §184d.

"Let not the Sun's heart be full (of wrath)"[461] 4:192:17ff.[462]

In another instance, the apodosis of a conditional sentence

is left unsaid: *šumma atta ul tīdēšu ahūšu ša PN šūt* "In

case (if) you do not know him (, I will tell you:) he is

PN's brother" 4:193:17ff. Finally, as noted by von Soden,[463]

phrases beginning with *aššum*, at the head of the main body

of many letters, are also unfinished sentences (cf. our *in*

re): e.g., *aššum pāṭīka ša tašpura* "(I am writing/This is

a reply) concerning your borders, about which you wrote me"

4:188:6f. Oaths, since they are incomplete conditional

sentences, are also a form of ellipsis; see the next section.

b. Oaths.

The oath in K is always an uncompleted conditional

sentence, i.e., a protasis without an apodosis (and so, a

form of ellipsis). Literally, then, the form is: "if I

do X (, I am cursed)."[464] All examples but one are denials

461Cf. *AHw*, 597b (*malû* G 8); the idiom recurs in a
letter that is probably from Khatti, *PRU* 4:222:13,30f., and
(in the D) 26f. Nougayrol cites a Hittite parallel, *PRU* 4,
192, n. 2.

462It is likely that ellipsis, also omission of the
object, occurs when *tamû* is used intransitively (even though
this happens throughout Akk.; cf *AHw*, 1317b - *tamû* G II).
The verb seems originally to have meant "to mention, invoke
(a DN) solemnly"; the DN, or *nīš ili*, or the like, is usu-
ally omitted, and the verb comes to mean simply "to swear"
e.g., *ina GN ina māmīti itammûni* "They will swear by an
oath" 4:156:21f. By this period, the oaths themselves only
rarely--and never in K--involve the mention of a DN; see
below, for examples.

463*GAG* §184c.

464Cf. *GAG* §185g-1.

of (involvement in) past events, and thus are non-negated clauses. All tenses occur; note e.g., the following examples from 4:161ff.: pret.: *šumma karānīšunu nēnu nakkis-mi* "We did not tear down their vineyards" *l.9'*; perf.: *šumma ana mamma amīli šanîm-ma ana šīmi nattadin-mi ū nattak(k)ir-mi*[465] "We have not sold or taken away (servants of RN) to anyone else" *l.25'*; dur. Gtn: *šumma šikara nēnu...nattanaddin-mi* "We have not been giving beer..." *l.17'f.*; preformative stative: *u šumma amīlī...nīdē-mi* "Nor do we know the men..." *l.10'*. One promissory oath occurs, also negative: *šumma ina arki ūmi PN₁ PN₂ mārūšunu...aššum zittīšunu ana muhhi RN...iraggumū* "In future, PN₁ and PN₂, their children...will not contest against RN...concerning their inheritance" 4:122:14ff.[466]

In one instance, the verb of an oath is apparently subjunctive, as is the case in Ass.: *šumma...niddūku* "We did not kill..." 5:95:45ff.; see above, p. 61.

c. Parenthesis.

There is one instance of a parenthetical insertion into a sentence:[467] *inanna šar GN 7 napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīlū 4 sinnišātu kīmū bīt PN₁...ana PN₂ ittadin* "Now,

---

[465]On the form and meaning of this word, see above, 65.

[466]Compare with this the ubiquitous prohibition *ina arki ūmi PN₁ aššum X ana muhhi PN₂ lā iraggum*, e.g., 4:173: 12ff.

[467]Cf. *GAG* §182.

the king of GN has given 7 'souls' (among them 3 men and
4 women) to PN$_2$ in exchange for the estate of PN$_1$..." 4:
168:8ff.

d. Casus Pendens.

There is only one certain example of a casus pendens,[468]
and it seems to have arisen not for emphasis, but to avoid
an even more awkward grammatical construction: *mannum-mê
ša rikilta annîta ušašnâ DN$_1$...DN$_6$ lū bēlū māmîtišu* "As for
anyone who alters this treaty, may DN$_1$...DN$_6$ be the lords
of his oath" 4:156:49ff. There are other sentences whose
first constituent *may* be a casus pendens: e.g., the fre-
quent *ša iraggum tuppu annû ile''ešu* may mean "As for who-
ever contests, this tablet will defeat him," but the sen-
tence could simply have word order O-S-V, with a resumptive
pronoun on the verb.[469] In *PN ištu X kaspi qātšu ēteli*,
4:166:5 (cf. 6f.), *PN* may be topicalized: "As for PN, he
forfeited X silver (i.e., his hand went up from...)"; how-
ever, it is also possible that the scribe misunderstood
the idiom,[470] and intended *qātšu* as an adverbial acc. ("PN
went up with respect to his hand..."). Finally, a nominal
sentence such as *X kaspu...annû šū*, 4:176:11f., may be nor-

___

[468]Von Soden refers to "zusammengesetzte Nominalsätze";
cf. *GAG* §128.

[469]See above, pp. 158f.

[470]See above, pp. 45f.

mal grammar for K, reflecting WS influence, with *šū* almost
as a copula:[471] "The X silver...is this"; or, the begin-
ning of the sentence may be a casus pendens: "As for the
X silver..., it is this."

e. Anacoluthon.

Anacoluthon,[472] or the change to new grammar in the
middle of a sentence, is rare in K. The only examples I
can find are: *u RN₁ ištu GN₁ ša ištu [kakkīš]u(?) ileqqû
u [ša] ina mātīšu...irrubû šumma ina arki ūmi RN₂ ardīšu
errišu u RN₁ mimma lū lā utarraššunūti* "And RN₁, out of GN₁,
those whom he takes by his weapons(?), or who enter his
land...--if in future RN₂ demands his servants (back), RN₁
is in no way obligated to return them" 4:54f.:9ff.; *RN₁ šar
GN₁ dunnāti ša šar GN₂ ša FN...ukallu inanna šar GN₁ ana
RN₂ šar GN₂ uttēr* "RN₁ king of GN₁ the fortified estates of
the king of GN₂, which FN...holds--now then, the king of
GN₁ has returned (them) to RN₂ king of GN₂" 4:208:1ff. In
one instance, *šumma* is repeated to clarify an awkward sen-
tence: *šumma tuppa kanku ša hepû šumma ša X kaspi šū...*
"if the sealed tablet which was broken--if it is the one of
X silver..." 4:177:17f.

————————————

[471]See above, pp. 96f., and n. 249.

[472]Cf. *GAG* §183.

PART II

THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF UGARIT

A. THE CORPUS

The corpus on which the following study of the Akk. dialect of Ugarit is based consists of 23 letters, 201 legal texts, and 29 economic texts. They are listed below, by excavation number (and place of publication) for texts found at Ras Shamra, by the number in Knudtzon's *EA* for texts found at el-Amarna.

a. *Letters* (L):

*15.11 (3:19)	*20.182A(+)B (5:111f., no 36)
*15.14 (3:5)	20.184 (5:97f., no. 28)
16.112 (3:4)	20.200C (5:100, no. 29)
*17.239 (6:11f., no. 8)	20.238 (5:87f., no. 24)
17.455 (6:5b, no. 3)	*20.239 (5:141f., no. 52)
19.70 (4:294)	*1957.2 (*AnOr*48:23f.)
*19.80 (6:2f., no. 2)	*EA*45
*20.13 (5:137, no. 49)	**EA*46
*20.23 (5:145f., no. 54)	**EA*47
*20.158 (5:139f., no. 51)	**EA*48
20.168 (5:80ff., no. 21)	*EA*49.
20.178 (5:147f., no. 55)	

Only ten letters may be said with certainty to have been written at Ugarit. In eight cases, the sender is a king of Ugarit: 3:4; 4:294;[1] 5:80ff.; 5:87f.; 5:97f.; 5:100; *EA*45; *EA*49. The sender of 5:147f. is one Rap'anu, in whose house in Ugarit the letter was found. 6:5b was sent to a king of Ugarit by his prefect (*sākinnu*).

---

[1]This was sent by a king and queen together.

The probability that the rest of the above letters found at Ras Shamra were written there is in each case quite high: *3:5 and *5:111f. are almost certainly from a king of Ugarit, and *6:2f. from a Ugaritic queen; *3:19, *5:139f., and *5:141f. were written to the prefect[2] by superiors or peers who were probably officials in the court at Ugarit or in its provinces; *5:145f.[3] is a double letter to Rap'anu (see above), thus, a copy of two letters--one from the prefect (sākin), and one from a servant of Rap'anu; *5:137 is also a double letter, to an individual who is elsewhere listed as a courtier of the queen[4]-- a copy of a letter from "the queen," and a copy of a letter from a superior or peer; *6:11f. is from the prefect (sākinnu) to an inferior official; AnOr48:23f. is to the king from a servant of his, and a GN mentioned in the text is known to have been in the state of Ugarit.[5]

---

[2] rābiṣu (LÚMAŠKIM) in *3:19; sākinu in *5:141f. In *5:139f., the sender is one Uzzinu, who in another text (PRU 4:237:6f., probably from Khatti) is called šākin (LÚŠA.KÍN) Ugarit.

[3] This letter was written by a very inexperienced scribe; note the following aberrations: no case-ending on LÚsa-ki-in (l.1); šul-ma (nom.) (l.3); it for itti (ll.7,24,25,26); šul-ma-na (l.8; elsewhere šulmānu/i; cf. l.22); ṭé(-)KUR(-)er-an-nu for ṭēma terranni (l.8; cf. l.27; see below, 258, n.358). a-mi-nu for am-mīni (l.11); tu-ú-ha-ri for tuhhar (l.11); ú-ri-di-ia for arādiya (l.13); two scribal omissions: pa-<ni->ka (l.14); um<-ma> l.20. Because of the abnormality of its forms, this text is only sporadically referred to in the following sections.

[4] Yankhamu, called a mūdû šarrati in 3:162b:6; cf. 5, 136, n. 4.

[5] Cf. Astour's commentary in AnOr48, 25f.

There is less certainty in the case of the other three letters found at el-Amarna. The type of clay is apparently the same; and the script is the same.[6] What can be discerned about the grammar show no peculiarities vis-à-vis other U texts. However, their Ugarit origin must remain less probable than the other texts. Thus, they will be used with much caution below, serving only as secondary, or additional, information; they will be marked with a double asterisk (**).

Three other letters were probably sent by Ugaritic officials: *PRU* 4:221ff. (17.383); *PRU* 4:223ff. (17.422); *Ug.* 5:129f. (no. 44; 20.219). However, the officials were stationed outside the state of Ugarit, and it is likely that the letters were written by scribes where they were stationed: Khatti in the case of the first two; Siyannu in the third.

Several other texts are noted by Kühne[7] as possibly originating in Ugarit. In one case (5:104, no. 32; 20.243), the probability is quite high. But the text is so badly broken--never more than six signs visible, at the ends of the lines--that there is little point in including it in the study; it provides no new information. With the rest

---

[6]Cf. W.F. Albright, "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter f from Ugarit," *BASOR* 95 (1944), 30; M. Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit* (Rome: Università di Roma, Studi Semitici 6, 1962), 23.

[7]*UF* 7, 129ff.

of the texts,[8] there is simply not enough evidence to determine their place of origin, and so they too have been excluded from our corpus.

b. *Legal or Juridical Texts* (J):

8.145 (*Syl*18:249f.)	15.167+163 (3:124)
8.207 (3:34b)	15.168 (3:136f.)
8.208 (3:110f.; *Syl*18:253f.)	15.173 (3:40b)
8.213 (*Syl*18:251f.)	15.180 (3:36c)
3.279 (3:170b)	15.182 (3:35f.)
11.856 (*RA*38:5)	15.190 (3:137b)
14.16 (*Syl*28:173e.)	15.Y (3:78)
15.37 (3:35a)	15.Z (3:58f.)
15.41 (3:38b)	16.61 (3:39a)
15.81 (3:37a)	16.86 (3:137f.)
15.85 (3:52f.)	16.114 (3:33f.)
15.89 (3:53b)	16.129 (3:32f.)
15.90 (3:54a)	16.131 (3:138f.)
15.91 (3:75b)	16.132 (3:140f.)
15.92 (3:54ff.)	16.133 (3:59f.)
15.109+16.296 (3:102ff.)	16.134 (3:141f.)
15.114 (3:112f.)	16.135 (3:89f.)
15.118 (3:131a)	16.136 (3:142b)
15.119 (3:86ff.)	16.137 (3:143a)
15.120 (3:56f.)	16.138 (3:143ff.)
15.122 (3:131f.)	16.139 (3:145f.)
15.123+16.152 (3:89a)	16.140 (3:45f.)
15.126 (3:112a)	16.141 (3:60b)
15.127(+?)15.131 (3:132, 3:133)	16.142 (3:77b)
	16.143 (3:81ff.)
15.132 (3:133f.)	16.144 (3:76a)
15.136 (3:121f.)	16.145 (3:169)
15.137 (3:134f.)	16.147 (3:90b)
15.138+16.393B (3:101f.)	16.148+254B (3:115f.)
15.139 (3:166f.)	16.150 (3:47a)
15.140 (3:136f.)	16.153 (3:146f.)
15.141 (3:136b)	16.154 (3:127f.)
15.143+164 (3:117)	16.156 (3:61f.)
15.145 (3:122f.)	16.157 (3:83b.)
15.146+161 (3:58a)	16.158 (3:62b)
15.147 (3:125)	16.160 (3:76b)
15.150 (3:171a)	16.162 (3:126)
15.155 (3:118)	16.163 (3:169f.)

---

[8]E.g., 15.63 (3:20); 20.15 (5:143f., no. 53); 20.19 (5:135, no. 48); 20.141B (5:108, no. 34); 20.232 (5:154f., no. 58).

17.376+377 (6:25f., no. 23) 19.78 (6:52f., no. 52)
17.378A (6:48f., no. 49) 19.98 (6:32f., no. 31)
17.388 (6:50, no. 50) 19.128 (6:34b, no. 32)
17.408 (6:34f., no. 33) 20.146 (5:176f., no. 83)
17.410 (6:35b, no. 34) 20.176 (5:181, no. 86)
17.426 (6:51f., no. 51) 20.203B (5:182f., no. 87)
18.21 (6:44f., no. 45) 20.226 (5:176a, no. 82)
18.22 (6:55f., no. 55) 20.236 (5:179f., no. 85)
18.53 (6:27a, no. 24) 20.252A (5:185, no. 90)
18.264 (6:62b, no. 65) 21.07A (5:183f., no. 88)
18.274 (6:62f., no. 66) 21.230 (5:173f., no. 81)
18.280 (6:42b, no. 42) 27.053 (6:53, no. 53).
18.500 (6:32a, no. 30)

The U legal texts form the largest single group of Akk. documents discovered at Ugarit. There are enough of them that it is possible to include only those that can be determined with certainty to have been composed there. Thus, a number of texts, such as *PRU* 3:41a (16.180), which do not bear the name or seal of a Ugaritic king, and whose content suggests the possibility that they were issued elsewhere, have been omitted from consideration. Several others listed by Kühne[9] as U texts have also been excluded from consideration, because they are mere fragments that contain no evidence for the grammar.

Text 6:50 (no. 50; 17.388) was written by an inexperienced scribe, and contains a number of forms (especially verbs) that do not conform to those in the rest of the texts: *e-na-da-ni* (for *inaddin* or *ittadin*; l.7); *e-te-e-ru* (for *itūrū* or *iturrū*; l.15); *te-ṣa-bi-tu₄*[10] (for *iṣabbatū*;

_____
[9]*UF* 7, 129ff.

[10]This form is discussed below, pp. 230f.

l.16); *û-ma-la-e* (for *umallû*; *ll*.17,19); A.SI.MI (for *šum-ma*?; *l*.14). As Nougayrol notes,[11] since the scribe wrote the PN's properly, it is in fact the grammar that he was unfamiliar with. This text, like *5:145f.(L), will, with few exceptions, be referred to only in the notes, since its forms are not normative for the U dialect.

Because of the number of U legal texts that mention or bear seals incribed with the name of the king under whom they were issued, it is possible, as mentioned in the Introduction, to study them chronologically. Because of their rigorously formulaic nature, they did not undergo a great many changes over the century and a half during which they were written. Nevertheless, a few innovations or shifts occurred, and these have been noted where appropriate.

c. *Economic Texts* (Ec.)

Only the following economic dockets are cited in the sections below:

11.732 (3:181f.)	19.08 (6:112b, no. 145)
11.839 (3:194f.)	19.19A (6:104f., no. 134)
12.34+43 (3:192f.)	19.20 (6:119a, no. 156)
15.76 (*PRU* 2:116, repub-	19.23 (6:119b, no. 157)
lished without no.	19.24 (6:120a, no. 158)
in 6:99)	19.32 (6:74b, no. 77)
15.135 (3:206f.)	19.36 (6:108b, no. 138)
16.257... (3:199ff.)	19.41 (6:75f., no. 78)
17.50 (6:68f., no. 70)	19.43 (6:91f., no. 94)
17.64 (6:96b, no. 116)	19.57 (6:101a, no. 127)
17.136 (6:96f., no. 117)	19.71 (6:95c, no. 114)
17.361C (6:74a, no. 76)	19.99 (6:123f., no. 166)
17.476 (5:20b, no. 13)	19.104 (6:101b, no. 128)

---

[11]*PRU* 6, 50, n. 1.

```
19.127 (6:112f., no. 147)   20.12 (5:189f., no. 96)
19.130 (6:90a, no. 101)     20.211A/B... (5:195ff., no.
19.141 (6:98c, no. 121)        105).
```

There are in fact over 150 economic texts that were written at Ugarit. Most of them are mere lists of names of persons or occupations, town, quantities of objects, and the like, many of them written almost entirely in logo-grams.[12] These can add very little to our evidence for the phonology and morphology of the dialect; since they contain no clauses, they add nothing at all to our knowledge of the syntax. Thus, the bulk of these texts are not cited in this study. However, there are a few texts that do provide us with some information, especially for the morphology. It is these that are referred to sporadically below, and that have therefore been listed above.

d.   Since the mythological and literary texts, and the syllabaries, vocabularies, and lists of weights and measures, were undoubtedly copied from, or at least based upon, Mesopotamian originals, they have been excluded from the corpus of texts upon which this study is based.

---

[12]E.g., *PRU* 3:205b (16.155); *Ug.* 5:17ff. (no. 12; 17. 150+34); *Ug.* 5:187f. (no. 95; 20.01); *Ug.* 5:189f. (no. 96; 20.12); etc.

B. NOTES ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

a.   Logograms are infrequent in the letters and legal

texts, but naturally occur more often in economic dockets.

For the most part, they are employed correctly. However,

there are a few mistakes. In 3:102ff.:52 (and probably in

*l.*18 as well), we have ŠU.BA.AN.TE for *ilqe* instead of ŠU.

BA.AN.TI (see below, paragraph g).

     The expression *ina ūmi balāṭīšu* "for all the days of

his life," is written several different ways, incorporating

logograms; see below, p. 305, n. 502.

     In 6:48:7', the logogram for *zittašu* "his share,"

which is in the nom., is correctly written HA.LA-*šu*. But

in *l.*15', *a-na* HA.LI is written; apparently the scribe

considered the logogram to be a declinable noun.[13] In *5:

145f., a badly written text (see p. 165, n. 3), HAL.LA.MEŠ

occurs, probably for the related adjective *zīz(ūt)u* "divi-

ded up."[14]

b.   The determinatives MEŠ and HI.A are of course found

throughout the corpus as means of marking the plural: e.g.,

DINGIR.MEŠ...KÚR-*ru-ki* "may the gods...protect you" 5:148:

8ff. A.ŠÀ.HI.A *an-nu-ti* [15] "these fields" 3:123:19. Not

---

[13]Cf. *ki-e* UR.KI "like a dog" *EA*138:96 (from Byblos),
instead of normal UR.KU=*kalbu*. This was pointed out by W.
L. Moran, "Byblos," 177.

[14]Cf. the similar use of TIL(.LA) for *balāṭu* instead
of normal TI(.LA), *p.* in Amarna letters from Syria-Pales-
tine; see *EA* II, 1388, for examples.

[15]On the gender, see below, pp. 314f.

infrequently, however, they do not indicate plurality.
Sometimes, e.g., MEŠ is used to indicate the abstract end-
ing -*ūt*, undoubtedly because it is homophonous with the
adjectival m. pl. ending; the clearest examples of this
are: *a-na* É.GI.A.MEŠ(-*šu*) for *ana kallūtī(šu)* "in marriage
(lit.: for daughter-in-law-ship)" 3:60b:9,13; *(a-na)* DUMU.
MEŠ(-*šu*) for *(ana) marūt(īšu)* "in adoptive sonship" 3:55:
6(bis). Other probable instances are: LÚ.MEŠDAM.GÀR-*(ut-)ti*
for *tamkārūt(t)i*[16] "status of trader" 6:32:10,13; LÚ.MEŠ*mar-*
ia-nu-ti "status of *maryannu*" 6:33:23 (cf. *i-na* LÚ.MEŠ*mar-*
ia-an-ni "among the m.'s" 3:140:6); LÚŠÀ.TAM.MEŠ for *šatam-*
mūti[17] (gen.) "office of steward" 3:132:30; cf. 6:29:30.

     In most cases, however, when the determinatives do
not denote plurality, they seem to serve no other purpose
than to mark the sign(s) they follow as logograms.[18] They
occur, e.g., on logograms for sg. verbs: BA.UG$_7$.MEŠ *mi-ta-*
ku "(if) I die" 3:76a:5; SUM.MEŠ for *iddin* "he gave" 3:103:
19 (vs. ŠU.BA.AN.[TI]E for *ilqe* "he took" in *l*.18); on nouns
modified by sg. adjectives: e.g., A.ŠÀ.HI.A *an-nu-ú/*
an-na-a/an-ni-i 3:121f.:9,14,19, and often; LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-ú*
"another man" 3:114:26; on an adjective modifying a sg.
noun: *hi-iṭ-ṭa* GAL.MEŠ "a great crime" 3:97:15.[19] The

---

[16]*AHw*, 1315b.

[17]*AHw*, 1199b.

[18]Cf. Nougayrol's comment in *Ug.* 5, 146, n. 2.

[19]Note also *a-na-ku…lū* ÌR.MEŠ-*ma* "I am indeed a ser-
vant..." **EA47:10f.

logogram for *kaspu* "silver" is most often simply KÙ.BABBAR,
e.g., 3:60b:14,16; 3:33a:7. However, it is not uncommon
for it to be followed by MEŠ:[20] e.g., 3:106:12; 3:112:10;
in 3:93b:4,5,6, it occurs with and without MEŠ. Occasion-
ally, HI.A follows: e.g., 3:89b:6. It is most likely
that in all cases, the sg. *kaspu* is intended. It is also
likely that these determinatives do not mark the pl. in
other instances, but for contextual rather than grammatical
reasons: e.g., *10 kaspa ina* MU.MEŠ*(šatti) uppal* "He will
pay 10 silver per year" 3:84:21 (cf. *ina* MU-*te-šu* 3:135a:
14); *tapaṭṭar ana* SILA.MEŠ *(sūqi)* "She will depart into
the street" 3:60b:15; *kasap* NÌ.MÍ.ÚS.A.MEŠ-*ša (terhatīša)*
"the silver of her bride-price" ibid.:14.

In the following sections, it will be assumed that
MEŠ and HI.A do denote plurality, unless either the con-
text or the grammar indicates otherwise. But it must be
pointed out that this assumption may not always be correct.
As will be shown below (pp. 311ff.), a pl. subject may have
a sg. verb, and a pl. noun may be referred to by a sg.
pronoun. Thus, it is impossible to determine whether the
subject is sg. or pl., e.g., in LÚ.MEŠ*ub-ru...ul errub-ma*
"The *u.*-officials may not enter..." 3:141:20f., or the
number of A.ŠÀ.MEŠ in *FN šarratu tattaši* A.ŠÀ.MEŠ...*u tat-
tadinšu* "FN the queen took the field(s)...and gave it/them"

---

[20]Similarly for *hurāṣu* "gold": note GUŠKIN 3:99a:7,
but GUŠKIN.MEŠ in 3:181:3(Ec.).

3:50b:2ff.

c.   There are only two verbs in these texts which begin
with an extra vowel sign.[21] Both are I-ʾ, as is normally
the case when this feature occurs in OB: G dur.: *e-ep-pa-aš*
*6:3:26; D dur.: *ú-up-pal*[22] 6:32:11.

d.   There is only one example, apart from verbs II-*w*, of
the doubling of a final root consonant before a vocalic
ending:[23] *id-din-nu* (for *iddinū*) 3:59a:18.

e.   There are very few doublings in the writing of con-
sonants that should be single. As in K, the WS word
šākinu "prefect" is most often written with double -*nn*-:
e.g., LÚ*sà-ki-in-ni* 3:36a:10; 6:5:3; I*sà-ki-in-ni* *6:11:1;
but LÚ*sà-ki-ni* *5:141:2.[24] The G perf. of *našû*, which is
correctly written *it-ta-ši* over 70 times, occurs seven
times with the second radical written double: *it-ta-aš-ši*.[25]
The two forms never appear together in the same text. This
is the only verb to exhibit this incorrect doubling in the

_____

[21]This feature was discussed more fully above, p. 22.
For other forms of verbs I-ʾ, see below, pp. 249ff.

[22]Other occurrences of *uppulu*, and reasons for reading
uppulu rather than *(w)abālu*, are cited below, pp. 250f.

[23]See above, pp. 22f.

[24]For K, see p. 23. In *5:145:1, read probably I*sà-
ki-in<-ni>(?)*; but cf. P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 290.

[25]3:67b:4; 3:129:11; 3:131b:4; 3:148f.:3,15; 3:150:4;
f. *ti-it-ta-aš-ši* 3:129:4 (vs. *ta-at-ta-ši-šu* 3:49b:16).

perf. The reason it does so is not clear; it is unlikely
that the Gtn pret. is intended. The stative of *zakû* is
twice written with double *-kk-*:[26] *za-ak-ki* 3:110a:5;
za-ak-ka! 3:166:16'. The sporadic spelling *da-ri-it-ti*
for *dārīti* (e.g., 3:70:19; 3:74:8) is probably Assyrian.[27]
Note also the f. p. written with double *-tt-* in *qa-ta-at-ti*
(for *qātāti*) "security" 3:37a:4,11.

f.   A few unexpected extra vowel-signs for short vowels
occur:[28] e.g., *za-a-ki* (*zaki*) 3:162b:9; [*ša*]*-a-na-am*
(*šanâm*) 3:154:15; *lu-ú-uš-ku-un* (*luškun*) *5:140:30.[29] A
unique spelling of a final long vowel (not due to contrac-
tion) is *i-zu-zu-û* in 5:173:23. The tense is not certain:
dur. *izuzzū*, or pret. or perf. *iz(z)uzū*.

g.   Several broken writings occur. In verbs II-ʾ, these
are normal: e.g., *iš-a-am* 5:8:18; *li-iš-al-šu* 3:84:28.
Other forms also indicate the presence of ʾ: e.g., LÚ.MEŠ
mur-i (for *murʾī*[30]) 3:162b:5. Incorrect broken writings
are quite rare. In two instances, the 1s acc. suffix is

----

[26]Perhaps the forms are Ass. D statives; see below,
p. 286, n. 454.

[27]Cf. *GAG* §20d.

[28]This phenomenon is quite common in Akk. texts from
Boghazkoy; cf. Durham, "BoAkk," 394ff.

[29]Also *tu-ú-ha-ri* (for *tuhhar*?) in *5:146:11.

[30]This is a Ugaritic word; cf. nom. *mru*, gen. *mri*,
cited in *UT* §1543, p. 437.

simply "tacked on" verbs ending in a consonant: *iṣ-ṣa-bat-an-ni* *5:112:13; *li-din-an-ni*[31] *EA*49:21. Such writings occur sporadically in many Akk. dialects, and are encountered (albeit rarely) already in OB.[32] The ventive plus 2ms dat. suffix is similarly attached in ⌜*ul-te-b*⌝*il-ak-ku* 5:100:r3' (cf. *ul-te-*⌜*bíl*⌝ *6:3:42, but *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'). In 5:87f., a text that contains several other difficulties,[33] two words in a row are written incorrectly: *ù a-ma-at maš-ik-ta it-ep-šu-na-a-ši* "they did an evil thing to us" *ll*.30f. Compare the last word to the correct writing *i-te-*[*e*]*p-šú* in *l*.18. Finally, note also the unique form *i-tu-ir-ru-ni*? for *iturrūni* in 6:39:13.

h.   There is a large body of evidence which indicates that, as in K, the vowels *i* and *e* were never necessarily written distinctly. This inference is based primarily on the frequent misuse, or interchangeability, of *Ci* and *Ce* signs, and even of the vowel-signs *I* and *E*. Note the following writings:

   i-nu-ma 3:68:7, but *e-nu-ma* *3:5:9; 5:98:10; *6:12a:7;

   a-na ma-an-ni-mi-i (for *mannim-mê*) 3:166:r10', but

[31]Acc. for dat. suffix ("may he give to me"); see below, pp. 200f.

[32]*GAG* §7b.

[33]E.g., *a-ma-at*, incorrectly in the absolute state (*ll*.16,30); *il-* ⌜*ták*⌝*-ka*, probably for *il-la!-ka* (*l*.12); note also *-šú* in *l*.18, but *-šu* in *l*.31; ⌜*i*⌝*-*[*d*]*e* in *l*.19, but *i-de₄* in *l*.36.

ma-nu-um-me-e 3:64:13; cf. *mi-nu-um-me-e* Sy18:5;
etc.;[34] cf. also [*ma-an-nu-u*]*m-mi-e* 3:108:19;

hi-i-ya-šu[35] 3:123:6,11, but É*he-e-ya* 3:87:r9'; É*he-e-ia*
ibid.:r7';

-*mi* (particle of direct speech) *3:19:7,19,23, but -*me*
ibid.:14,18,21; etc.;[36]

ṣa-mi-it 3:35a:8, and often,[37] but *ṣa-me-it* 3:146:10;

mi-im-mi-šu 3:52b:16, etc.,[38] but *mi-me-šu* 3:85:9;

[*mi*]-*im-me* 3:146b:5; [*m*]*i-im-me-e-šu* 3:100:6;

LÚ*na-ia-lu-ti* 5:13:6, but LÚIGI-*te* ibid.:2; cf. LÚ.MEŠ
IGI.MEŠ-*ti* 5:10:2; 6:52:2; LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-ti* 3:35a:2;
etc.;[39]

tup-pa-ti sà-ar-ru-ti 3:97f.:17f., cf. 23, but *mar-kab-te*[40] ibid.:28.;

*a-wa-te*MEŠ 3:108:19; *a-ma-te*MEŠ-*su* 5:98:r5'; cf. *6:3:
36 (all Bab. forms[41]);

---

[34]Other forms are cited below, pp. 205ff.

[35]This may be a Ugaritic word; cf. *AHw*, 339b; Nougayrol,
PRU 3,216, under "Biens...(1 d)," and 218, under "Castels..."

[36]All forms are cited below, pp. 281ff.

[37]See below, p. 234, n. 258.

[38]See below, pp. 211ff.

[39]Cf. also Sy18:249:4; Sy18:251:4.

[40]A Ugaritic word (*mrkbt*; cf. *UT* §2331, p. 484, vs.
Akk. *narkabtu*), as noted by Nougayrol, *PRU* 3, 98, n. 1.

[41]Ass. forms are written with *b*; see above, p. 24, and
n. 30.

ŠU.BA.AN.TE *il-qè* for ŠU...TI[42] in 3:105:52;

ti-še-em-me (for *tešemme*) **EA47:22;

li-ši-bu-ki (for *lišebbûki*) 5:148:10, but *û-še-ri-ib*

     5:173:6,11;

bi-ri(-šu-nu) 5:173:5,21,22; 5:11:8,9, but *be-ri(-šu-nu)*

     5:12:r5'; *Sy*28:174:8.

    This evidence is corroborated by G third person forms

of verbs I-',[43] in which the prefix vowel in unambiguously

marked;[44] it appears as *i* 16 times, as *e* 11 times:

dur.	dur.
i-lak 3:105:54	*e-ep-pa-aš* *6:3:26[45]
i-kal-šu 3:92:14	*e-pu-šu* 3:166:r9'
i-ru-ub 3:105:53,55 3:107:8[46]	*e-ru-ub-ma* 3:141:21,24
i-ru-bu 3:98:26	*e-ru-bu* 3:163:r3'; 3:98:25
i-be-er 3:73:12,13	*e-kim-šu* 3:34f.:23

---

   [42]Cf. *CAD* L, 131.

   [43]No first or second person forms of I-' verbs occur in the G.

   [44]Vs. e.g., *i/ek-ki-im-šu* 3:62:18.

   [45]For Nougayrol's *i-pû-aš* "will do" 5:183:11', read probably *i-ba-aš<-ši>* "belongs (lit.: is)." The scribe made another omission in *l.*7': *a-kán<-na>*.

   [46]Perhaps also *la i-ši-ib* 3:76a:9, if this is either a dur. or pret. of the verb *ešēbu*, meaning "may it (the house) not flourish," as Nougayrol interprets it. In spite of the rarity of this verb (cf. *CAD* E, 352a), this is more likely than taking the form as a pret. of *(w)ašābu* as M. Tsevat does in *JSS* 3 (1956), 237f.

pret.	pret.

$i\text{-}hu\text{-}uz\text{-}\check{s}i$ 3:76a:8; $e\text{-}ru\text{-}ub$ 3:139:17,20
     18:253:14

$i\text{-}pu\text{-}u\check{s}$ 3:34f.:6[47]

perf.	perf.

$i\text{-}te\text{-}ru\text{-}ub$ *3:19:11 $e\text{-}ta\text{-}na\text{-}ah$ 3:108:16

$i\text{-}te\text{-}ep\text{-}\check{s}u$ 3:72:5; $e!(A)\text{-}ta\text{-}na\text{-}ah$ 3:110a:7.
     3:97:15,17; 5:87:18

If, for the moment, we discount the prefix, we note that
only one form, $e\text{-}ep\text{-}pa\text{-}a\check{s}$, is necessarily Ass.; on the other
hand, the following cannot be Ass.: $i\text{-}te\text{-}ru\text{-}ub$ ($\bar{e}tarab$),
$i\text{-}te\text{-}ep\text{-}\check{s}u$ ($\bar{e}tap\check{s}u$).[48] The rest could be either Bab. or
Ass. ($eppu\check{s}u$ and $errub\bar{u}$ with Ass. vowel harmony). Further,
in texts 3:45f., 3:107f., and 3:98, both prefixes occur.
Thus, it must be concluded that the U scribes did not dis-
tinguish i and e as prefixes of verbs I-'.

The suggestion put forward above, that the scribes
never distinguished the two vowels in writing, is not viti-
ated by the fact that, in the majority of cases, the correct
sign appears. Most forms were learned by rote; therefore,
any incorrect spelling must suggest that, for the scribe in
question at least, a given sign C_1e had the same value as
C_1i. This in turn implies either (a) that i and e were

---

[47]Note also $i\text{-}pu\text{-}\check{s}u$ **EA47:9.

[48]It is quite possible that $i\text{-}ru\text{-}ub$ and $e\text{-}ru\text{-}ub\text{-}ma$ are
pret., in which case they could be either Bab. ($\bar{\imath}rub$) or
Ass. ($\bar{e}rub$). The pret. very often replaces the dur. in U;
see below, pp. 345ff. If they are dur., however, they are
Bab. (vs. Ass. $errab$).

distinct phonemes, but both could nevertheless be written
with either *Ci* or *Ce*,[49] or (b) that *i* and *e* were *not* pho-
nemically distinct for the scribe. Although neither alter-
native can be shown conclusively to be the correct one, one
group of forms argues for the second, namely, certain forms
of verbs III-weak. Consider the following:

dur.	dur.
i-le(-eq)/leq-qe[50]	*i-la(-aq)/laq-qe*[50]
ti-še-em-me[51]	*ta-laq-qe*[52]
	i-na-aš-ši[53]
	i-ma-aš-ši[54]

---

[49] An analogous situation must exist with the writing
of the velar stops (*g,k,q*) and the dental stops and sibi-
lants (*d,t,ṭ;z,s,ṣ*). These consonants are always distin-
guished in alphabetic cuneiform, and were presumably all
distinct phonemes. But in the U syllabic cuneiform, most
signs may be used to write any of the homorganic consonants
of the group to which they belong: e.g., *GA* for *ga*, *kà*, *qá*;
KA for *ga₁₄*, *ka*, *qà*; *QA* for *ga₅*, *ka₄*, *qa*; etc.

[50] For *ileqqe*, cf. 3:49a:16; 3:109a:14; 3:72:15, and *p.*;
for *ilaqqe*, cf. 3:92:12; 3:145:30; 3:117:r6; and *p.* There
is a discernible development in the occurrence of these
forms chronologically. As shown by the following table,
ileqqe is found over twice as often as *ilaqqe* in texts from
the reign of Niqmaddu II, but in all later reigns, *ilaqqe*
occurs almost exclusively:

	Niqmaddu II	Arhalbu	Niqmepa	Ammistamru II
ileqqe	13	--	1	4
ilaqqe	5	4	11	32.

[51] "You listen" **EA47:22.

[52] "She will take" 3:56:20.

[53] "He will take (up)" 5:176b:5; cf. also *i-ra-aš-ši*
5:5:2'; *i-ba-aš-ši* 5:88:34.

[54] "He will wash" (*mesû*) 3:55:13. On the sibilant, see
below, paragraph o.

      perf.   perf.

il-te-qe[55]   *il-ta-qe*[55]

ta-al-te-qè[55]   *ta-al-ta-qè*[55]

iq-te-bi[56]   *iq-ta-bi*[56]

tâq-te-bi[56]   *tâq-ta-bi*[56]

it-te-ši[57]   *it-ta-ši*[57]

ta-ar-te-ši[58]

il/êl-te-qè-mi[59]

      infin.   infin.

le-qè-e[60]   *la-qe-e*[60]

It is of course possible to account for most of these forms by saying that some are Bab. (e.g., *tešemme* (reading *te₆-*), *elteqe, iqtabi*, etc.), and others Ass. (e.g., *talaqqe, talteqe, iqtibi* (reading *-ti₇-*), etc.). But such a proposal

---

[55]"He/She took"; *iltaqe* is found only twice: 3:86:5'; 5:263b:6; *ilteqe* is much more common: 3:34a:4; 3:49b:20; 3:59b:5; 3:63b:11; 3:64b:5; 3:87:r6'; 3:90b:5; 3:102:2; 3:130a:3; 3:146a:5; 3:167:4,15; 6:24a:4'; note also the pl. *il-te-qu-ú* 3:159b:6; *il-te-qú-ni* 5:9:4. *talteqe* occurs in 3:56:22; 3:62:4; 3:83:26; *taltaqe* in 3:64b:3; note *ti-il-ta-qè* 5:173:2; and the 2mp *ta-al-ta-qu-mì* 3:170b:8' (see below, pp. 229f.). No chronological pattern of distribution of forms with *a* vs. forms with *e* is discernible for the perf. as is for the dur. (see n. 50, above).

[56]*iq-ta-bi* "he said" 3:76a:3; 5:81:23; 5:140:14; 5:176b:3; *5:112:10; AnOr48:23:9; *iq-te-bi* 3:170b:7'; 5:183b:7'; Syl8:249:3; *tâq-ta-bi* (2ms) *5:141:9; *tâq-te-bi* *3:19:5. Cf. *iq-te-bu-ú-šu* (3mp) *6:3:16.

[57]"He took (up)"; *it-ta-ši* occurs p. (over 70 times); *it-te-ši* only in 3:167:19.

[58]"She acquired" Syl8:249:6.

[59]"I took" *3:19:7.

[60]*leqè* 5:20:2(Ec.); *laqè* 5:81:12'(L).

would not explain the anomalous *iltaqe* and *taltaqe*, which

appear to be unique to U.[61] Obviously, there was a con-

siderable amount of confusion. Text 3:86f., e.g., has both

il-ta-qè (*l*.5) and *il-te-qè* (*l*.r6'); 3:64b has *ta-al-ta-qè*

(*l*.3) and *il-te-qè-ša* (*l*.5).[62] Since Bab. vowel contrac-

tion always occurs in these verbs (see below, p.260f.), it

is reasonable to assume that some, if not most, scribes

learned typical Bab. forms, such as *inašši, tanašši*,[63]

ittaši, tattaši,[64] and *ileqqe, teleqqe*,[65] *ilteqe, telteqe*.[66]

Now, it is not impossible that Ass. influence gave some

impetus to the confusion evident in the texts. But a more

comprehensive explanation of the vacillation in forms is

possible if it is assumed that there was no phonemic dis-

tinction between *i* and *e*. If this were so, all of the non-

Bab. forms could be explained as the result of analogies to

learned forms. Thus *InaššI* (with *I* representing *i* or *e*)

could give rise to *IlaqqI* and *ImaššI* (for Bab *imesse*);[67]

<hr/>

[61]That is, apart from OA; but influence from that dia-
lect seems unlikely here.

[62]Cf. also 3:159f., which has *il-te-qu-ú* (*l*.6), and
probably *i-l[aq-qè]*(*l*.20, vs. Nougayrol's *i-l[iq-qè]* ; cf.
the copy).

[63]No example of this form occurs, certainly by chance.

[64]3:49b:16.

[65]Cf. *tešemme*, cited above.

[66]No such form occurs, again, probably by coincidence;
cf. 1s *elteqe*.

[67]E.g., by analogy to pret. forms: *IššI:IlqI::InaššI:
IlaqqI*.

similarly *tanaššI* to *talaqqI*, *IttašI* to *IltaqI*, *tattašI* to

taltaqI, and so on. Conversely, a common (and learned)

form like *IltIqI* (*ilteqe*) could result in *IttIšI* (*itteši*)

and *IqtIbI* (*iqtebi*). The forms *taqtIbI*, *taltIqI*, and *tar-*

tIšI would thus not necessarily be Ass., but due to the

3ms forms just given, and pressure to have *ta-* as the 2ms

and 2fs prefix. A similar analogy could produce the (Ass.)

infin. *laqî* (*la-qe-e*; cf. *tal-mi-šu* 6:52:6). The form of

one verb that is not III-weak was also influenced in this

way: *il-te-ri-iq* "he stole" 6:48b:6' (cf. *il-tar-qu* *5:

141:7). The pervasive use of the *TE* sign in these analo-

gous forms is undoubtedly due to its use in the learned

forms (*il-te-qè*, etc.).

Note: the system of transliterating and normalizing

forms with *i* or *e* described for the K texts (above, pp. 25f.)

will also be used in this part.

i.   There are over 20 examples of D pret., perf. and

prec. verbs, and one Š pret.[68] In three cases, the second

syllable has $(a \rightarrow)e$:[69] *û-ze-ku-û* 3:170b:13; *û-te-bu-û*[70] 3:

---

[68]*uš-bal-ki-it* 3:84:26. Otherwise, apart from verbs
I-*w* (e.g., *uš-te-eṭ* 3:169:25) and verbs I-ʾ (e.g., *û-še-*
ri-ib 5:173:6,11), where *e* in the second syllable is due to
other phonological considerations, no other Š pret., perf.,
prec. or participial forms occur.

[69]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 40ff. It appears that *šubalkutu* was
susceptible to this change (in the appropriate forms); cf.
li-iš-bê-êl-ki-ta, *uš-te-bê-êl-ki-it-ma*, cited in Aro,
Glossar, 66, s.v.

[70]*tebû* does not occur in the D elsewhere; see p. 247.

70:24; *li-ši-bu-ki*[71] 5:148:10. All three forms are presumably the result of analogies to (unattested) sg. forms, since the assimilation is to a following *i*-vowel (i.e., *uparris→uperris*). The forms are too few in number to determine if it is significant that all of them are III-weak verbs. It is unlikely that the *e* of the last two verbs is due to the fact that they are III-*e*; J. Aro's study has shown that, in MB at least, the assimilation in verbs III-*e* (e.g., *uredde/i*) is due to this MB phenomenon, not to OB vowel harmony.[72] Examples of verbs without the assimilation are: *ú-za-(ak-)ki* 3:140:4, and often;[73] *ú-ma-al-li* 5:180: 10,16; *ú-ma-al-lu-ú* *Sy*18:252:23; *ú-ra-bi* 3:76a:10; *ú-na-ke-er* 3:105:56; cf. 3:134:10; *ú-kab-bi-i[t]* *Sy*18:250:25; *uk-ta-bi-it* 3:109a:12.

j.   With one exception, *ea* and *ia* have uniformly become *â* in U:[74] e.g., *an-na-a* (from *anniam*) 3:160:21; *na-da-at* (from *nadiat*) 5:87:25; *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* (from *ileqqeaš-šunūti*) *3:5:16; *-na-a-ši* (from *-niāšim*) 5:88:31. The exception is *ki-ia-am* EA45:26; *AnOr*48:23:8. According to

_____

[71]I.e., *lišebbûki* "may they sate you"; cf. *AHw*, 1207b.

[72]*SMbG*, 48. This is shown by the fact that forms such as *uradde/i* are equally common.

[73]Cf. also 3:32:3; 3:107b:4; 3:110a:4; 5:181:4; *Sy*18: 253:9. These examples, and the absence of a form *uzekki*, render *ú-ze-ku-ú* all the more peculiar.

[74]*GAG* §16i,k. In 3:111:11, read probably *za-ki-[ti]*. rather than Nougayrol's *za-ki-[at]*.

the examples listed in the dictionaries,[75] this writing, with one exception,[76] occurs elsewhere only in a few other Amarna letters from Syria-Palestine.[77] In U, note also *ka-am-ma* (*kâm-ma*) 5:87:25.

k. Initial *w* has been lost; cf. *aš-bu* 5:87:22,24; *ar-ka-na-šu*[78] "afterwards(?)" 3:70:20. It is written in one archaic form, however: [*w*]*a-ši-ib* *5:137:7. Writings of intervocalic *w* vacillate between *w* and *m*: *a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} 3:108:19, but *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ}-*su* 5:98:r5'; cf. *6:3:36; *û-wa-aš-šer*$_9$ 3:110b:4, but *û-ma-'-er* 3:81:32; cf. 3:172b:5'.[79] On three occasions, the (probably) Ass. form of the anaphoric pronoun (acc.) is written: *šu-wa-ti*[80] 3:96:15; 3:146:13; *Sy*18:250:26.

l. As in K, mimation has fallen out of the U dialect: e.g., on nouns: *ni-id-nu an-nu-û* 3:164:14; *di-na* 3:54:16; *re-ṣú-ti* 3:80:14; *e-pé-ši* 5:8:10; on the ventive: *il-tap-ra*

---

[75]*AHw*, 470; *CAD* K, 325ff.

[76]An OB letter, *ABIM* 20:20, cited in *CAD* K, 329a.

[77]From Cyprus (*EA*35:30), Qatna (*EA*53:41,61), Hazor (*EA*227:27); also from the same region, but specific place of origin unknown: *EA*56:38; *EA*250:15,35,40; *EA*292:27; *EA*337:19.

[78]On this form, see below, p. 274.

[79]The common word *aw/mîlu* is always written LÚ.

[80]See below, p. 203.

*3:5:12; il-te-$q\hat{u}$-ni 5:9:4; on dative suffixes: ul-te-bi-
lak-ku 5:98:r20'; [a]t-ta-ad-na-$šu$ 3:83:28. It is still
found explicitly only in certain fixed noun phrases: e.g.,
the first line of most legal texts is usually $ištu\ \bar{u}mi$
an-ni-$(i$-$)im$ "from this day," as in 3:121:1; but occasion-
ally, one encounters $ištu\ \bar{u}mi\ an$-ni-i, as in 3:35a:1.[81]
Another common phrase that usually has mimation is $urram$
$šēram$ "in future" (adverbial acc.), as in ur-ra-$am\ še$-ra-am
3:46:13; $\hat{u}$-ra-$am\ še$-ra-am 3:53b:16; but note $\hat{u}$-$ra\ še$-ra 3:
97:10; ur_5-$ra\ še$-ra 3:139:12; and even $\hat{u}$-ra-$am\ še$-ra 3:49b:
21, and ur-$ra\ še$-ra-am 3:53a:27. Sometimes the adjectives
$ann\hat{u}$ and $šan\hat{u}$ have mimation in the acc.: e.g., ni-id-na
an-na-am 3:59a:12 (but ni-id-$na\ an$-na-a 3:84:26, and so
usually); $ša$-na-am 3:97:8; 3:105:52 (but $ša$-na-a 5:11:11).
Since most of these examples are formulaic, and the rest
quite rare, they must be seen as archaisms.[82] Thus, as in
Part I, word-final signs -CVm will be transliterated and
normalized without -m:[83] e.g, $ša$-ni-ta_5 p. (but $ša$-ni-ta
6:62b:3); KUR-tu_4 5:87:25. Similarly, even though writings
of the pl. allomorph of the ventive with -NIM are more com-
mon than writings with -NI, the former will be read -ni_7.[84]

---

[81]Cf. also 3:45:1; 3:110b:1; 5:10:1.

[82]As in K; see p. 27, n. 37.

[83]In some forms, CVm's *must* be transliterated without
m: e.g., $ṣa$-bu-tu_4-ia "my wish(es)" *6:12a:8; i-na-bi-tu_4
"(if) they flee" 3:37b:9. Note also na-ak-tu_4-$šu$ 3:207:15
(Ec.), but na-$ak!$-tu ibid.:14.

[84]In the legal texts, the pl. ventive is written -NIM

When not final, mimation is retained, and the *m* assi-
milates to the following consonant: e.g., *am-mi-ni-im-ma*
*EA*45:15; *il-tāk-na-aš-šu* 3:140:5; *šak-na-ak-k[u]* 5:98:13.[85]

m.   The treatment of *š* before a dental[86] is not consis-
tent. In the letters, *iš-tu* occurs several times (e.g.,
*3:19:7,17; *5:140:17,21), *ul-tu* only once (*6:12:13). In
the other texts, *iš-tu* is by far the more common form. It
is always the form that occurs in the first line of legal
texts (*ištu ūmi annîm*), and predominates elsewhere as well.
However, *ul-tu* is found sporadically; in some texts, both
occur: e.g., 3:59f., 3:62b, etc. Otherwise, in the let-
ters, *š* has always become *l*: e.g., *il-tap-ra* *3:5:9, and
other perf. forms of *šapāru*;[87] *al-ta-kán* 3:4:12; *il-tar-qu*
*5:141:7; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'; cf. *6:3:42. When
these verbs occur in the legal texts, they exhibit the
shift as well: *il-ta-kán^{an}-šu* 3:134:12; cf. 3:140:5; *il-
te-ri-iq* 6:48:6'.[88] In four other forms, however, *š* is

eight times, -*NI* only four times. In the letters, -*NI* oc-
curs twice, -*NIM* only once, and that when not final: *il-
la-ku-ṅim-ma̓* *6:3:28. All the forms are cited below, pp.
237ff. In K, the pl. ventive always has -*NI*, except when not
final; see above, pp. 26f.

[85]Probably also *šu-up-ra-a[m-ma/i]* *5:142:13.

[86]Only examples before *t* occur.

[87]Cf. *3:19:5; 4:294:11; 5:81:9'; 5:98:r2'; *6:12:16.

[88]Cf. perhaps *it-ti-il-ta* 3:167:14, if from *ištēštu*
(so *CAD* I/J, 282b).

is still written: *aš-ta-pá-ak* 3:110b:7; *uš-te-eṣ* 3:169:25;
uš-te-rib 3:64b:10; *t[u-u]š-te-rib* 3:55:19.

n. As is the case in K, in only one form does a root
final dental or sibilant combine with -*š*- of a pronominal
suffix to become -*ss*-: *[i]r-ku-us-sú* 5:3:5. Another text,
3:54f., has the perf. *ir-ta-ku-us* in *l*.5, but, strangely,
ir-ku-uš-šu in *l*. 6 (see the next paragraph). In all other
instances, no change takes place: e.g., *mar-ši-it-šu* 3:
110a:11; LÚ*mu-ut-ša* 3:65a:21,26; *Sy*l8:254:16; *i-hu-uz-ši*
3:76a:8; cf. *Sy*l8:253:17; *li-ra-hi-iṣ-šu* 3:76a:9,13; *ik-ta-*
ša-ad-šu-nu-ti 3:97:21.

o. Several forms suggest that there was some confusion
between *s* and *š*: *sú-um-mu-uh/hu* 3:114:28; 3:137b:7'; 5:4:
11'; 5:5:5', but *šu-um-mu-uh*[89] 3:58a:8; *ir-ta-ku-us* 3:55:5;
but *ir-ku-uš-šu* ibid.:6 (abnormal assimilation to the suf-
fix?; cf. also *[i]r-ku-us-sú* 5:3:5); *li-iš-la-mu-ki* for ex-
pected *lišlimūki*[90] "may (the gods) be friendly to you" 5:148:
9; cf. probably *sa-al-m[i-iš]* "amiably" *EA*49:26; *i-ma-aš-ši*
"he will wash" 3:55:13, for expected *imesse*.[91] Finally,
for the 3fs genitive suffix, -*sa* occurs about half as many
times (11; none after dental or sibilant) as -*ša* (20 times),

---

[89]Cf., in a Boghazkoy text: *šu-u-um-mu-hu* *BoSt* 8:102:
35, cited in *AHw*, 1017 (*samāhu* D 3).

[90]See below, pp. 232f., n. 251.

[91]*AHw*, 647f.; cf. *ú-ul me-ši* "not washed" in an OB
text from Alalakh (*AT* 126:36).

and -*su* occurs once for the 3ms genitive suffix; for re-
ferences, see below, pp. 194ff. These examples are too
sporadic to determine whether this confusion is of a phono-
logical or merely graphic nature (i.e., read su_x-*um-mu-uh*
in 3:58a:8?; etc.).

p.   Nasalization of double voiced stops takes place in
ta-ma-an-g[ur][92] 3:60b:12, but not *i-ma-gàr* 6:52b:6. The
dur. of *nadānu* is usually *i-na-an-din*: e.g., 3:52a:24; 3:
55:10; 3:154:21; cf. *ta-na-an-din* (3fs) *Syl*8:250:26. However,
forms without nazalization are also encountered: e.g.,
i-na-din 3:75a:14; *ta-na-din-šu* (3fs) 3:53:13,15,16; *i-na-
di-nu-ni* (3mp) *5:142:20. No nominal forms occur in which
this feature, or the lack of it, would appear.[93]

---

[92]For this reading, see below, p. 244, n. 301.

[93]Except perhaps the problematic *ma-ad-da-du* in 5:8:9;
see below, p. 236.

C. MORPHOLOGY

1. *Personal Pronouns*

a. Independent.

    For the third person forms, see under the anaphoric

pronoun, below, pp. 202ff.

        1s: nom.: *a-na-ku* 3:76a:5; *EA*45:18; etc.; *a-na-ku-ma*

                *5:112:14; dat.: *a-na ia-ši Sy*18:249:5; *3:19:

                16; *a-na ša ia-a-ši* **EA*47:17.

        2ms: nom.: *at-ta* 5:98:rl3'; *5:145:9; *at-ta-mi* 3:114:

                20;[94] dat.: perhaps *ak-kà-ši!*[95] *5:137:19.

        1p: nom.: [n]*i-i-nu* *3:19:24.

    It is unlikely that *i* and *a* were distinct in this dia-

lect (see above, pp. 177ff.); if they were, however, the

1p form *nīnu* would be Bab. The 1s dat. form *yaši* is typi-

cal MB. The proposed 2ms form *ak-kaši* would be OB (see n.

95). The phrase *ana (ša) yaši* replaces the 1s dat. suffix

---

    [94]For *at-ta* in *3:19:11, see below, p. 275.

    [95]The line in question is read by Nougayrol: [à](?)
ag-ga-ya aš-r[a]*-n*[u *mi*]*-nu-me-e šul-ma-ni*; he translates:
"E[t] comment est-ce que tout va bien [là]-bas?" There are
a number of problems with this. First, *akkā'i* "how?" is
normally written with the '-sign (cf. *CAD* A/1, 273); secondly,
it is attested only in SB and NB. Most important, however,
is that the interpretation is unlikely on semantic grounds;
literally, it would mean: "How is all well-being there?";
but *akkā'i* is always used with a verb. I would suggest,
therefore, that either *ak-kà-ši* is written (collation is
needed), or that the word should be emended to that. *ak-
kaši* (for *ana kaši*) would take the place of *ittīka*; i.e.:
"Is there all well-being there with (lit.: to) you?" Nor-
mally in MB and WPA, the 2ms dat. pronoun is *kaša*; *kaši*
would thus be either an older form (cf. OB *kaši(m)*; *GAG* §41f;
AHw, 462b), or a re-formation in U on the basis of 1s *yaši*.

(ventive), which does not appear on any of the respective
governing verbs.

In four instances (*anāku(-ma)* in 3:76a:5; 3:83:28; *5:
112:14; *atta* in *5:149:9), the pronoun occurs in verbal
clauses, for emphasis. In 5:98:r13', *atta* is voc. The
other nom. forms are subjects of non-verbal clauses.

b.   The independent gen. pronoun *attu-* does not occur.

c. Genitive Suffixes.

1s: L: note the following contrasts: voc. ⌈*a-bi*⌉ 5:
       87:12, but nom. *a-bu-ia* ibid.:19,26; voc. *be-li*
       3:4:9; 5:98:9,r13'; but nom. EN-*ia* ibid.:10,r8';[96]
       *3:5 has voc. *be-li* (*l*.9) *and* EN-*ia* (*l*.26), and
       nom. EN-*ia* (*ll*.9,18); 5:81 has voc. *and* nom.
       a-bu-ia (*ll*.9,34); elsewhere, always -*ia*: e.g.,
       GAŠAN-*ia* (voc.) *6:3:21; KÙ.BABBAR-*ia* (nom.) *3:
       19:9; *ṣa-bu-tu₄-ia* (sg.?[97] nom.) *6:12:8; *a-ma-
       te*^MEŠ-*ia* (gen.-acc. pl.) *6:3:36; etc.

       J: always -*ia*: e.g., ŠÀM-*ia* (nom.) 3:170a:8;
       É-*ia* A.ŠÀ-*ia* *gáb-ba mim-mu-ia* (nom.) 5:11:6f.;

_____

96**EA*47:25 has voc. *be-li* (*l*.25); the case of the im-
mediately preceding EN-*ia* is probably gen.

97The word is construed as sg. in OB (usually *ṣibûtu*;
cf. *CAD* Ṣ, 107ff.); thus, it is an abstract in -*ût*. It may
be so used in the present example, in which case, the vowel
before the suffix is a sg. case-ending, a common phenomenon
in U (see below, pp. 223f.). The word may have been felt
to be a pl., i.e., *ṣabûtūya*, but this is less likely, since
the predicate is probably sg.: *enūma zēr hurāti ṣa-bu-tu₄-ia*
"Since/Now then *h.*-seed is my desire..."

DUMU.MEŠ-*ia* (nom.) 5:176a:7; etc.

The contrast between the nom and voc. forms of *abu* and *bēlu* in the letters is striking. Presumably, the voc. forms represent holdovers from an earlier letter-writing tradition,[98] since apart from them, the 1s suffix is always written -*IA*.[99] The precise significance of this writing, when -*ī* is expected (i.e., on nom.-acc. sg. nouns), is not clear. It may simply be a graphic convention, so that KÙ. BABBAR-*IA* would represent *kaspī*. The other alternative is that the allomorph -*ya* has been levelled through for all noun cases except a few (archaic?) vocatives.[100]

2ms: always -*ka*: e.g., *qa-al-lu-ut-ti-ka* (gen.) "your service(?)"[101] *5:137:7,8; ÌR-*ka* 3:4:3; etc.

---

[98]Not too early, however, since OB usually has *be-lí* for "my lord."

[99]Once also in K for -*ī*: ZI-*ia* (acc.) 3:8:22.

[100]If this latter alternative were the situation, KÙ. BABBAR-*IA* would represent either *kasapya* on the analogy of *kasapšu*, etc., or *kaspaya* (nom.), *kaspaya* (acc.), perhaps on the analogy of the MB development *abū/āya*, *ahū/āya* (cf. *GAG* §65i; Aro, *SMbG*, 67); an analogy with the gen. is also possible. The normalization *kaspu/aya* would be preferred if, e.g., *ṣa-bu-tuₕ-ia* (discussed above, n. 97), could be shown conclusively to be sg. But in the absence of clearer syllabically spelled words (e.g., *ka-sa-ap-ia* or *ka-as-pu-ia*), the matter must remain unresolved. Note that neither *kasapya* nor *kaspuya* (nom.) would be correct for the nom. in Ugaritic, where the declension of *kaspu* with 1s suffix is *kaspī* (nom.), *kaspaya* (acc.), *kaspiya* (gen.); cf. *UT* §6.6, p. 36. The phenomenon of representing the 1s suffix in all cases by -*IA* appears to be widespread in WPA. Further investigation, beyond the scope of this study, is needed.

[101]This word is not attested elsewhere; cf. *AHw*, 895a.

2fs: DUMU-*ki* 5:148:10'; *it-ti-ki* 5:173:26.

3ms: *a-ma-te*^MEŠ*-šu* 5:98:r5', but ÌR-*šu* (gen.) ibid.:

        10,r11'; *ni-id-nu-uš* 3:68:12, but DI-*šu-ma* ibid.:

        14; and elsewhere always -*šu*: e.g., *pil-ka-šu*

        (acc.) 6:32a:9, and often; *mu-da-at-šu* 3:162b:7;

        É(*būt*)-*šu* (nom.) 3:54a:20; (acc.) 3:48b:3,6,9;

        and often; note DUMU.MEŠ-*šú* DUMU.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ-*šu*

        (sic) 6:44:12.

Thus, the form is -*šu* in all but two examples, inclu-
ding occurrences with nouns ending in a dental (no examples
occur after a sibilant). The only explanation for the sin-
gle example of -*su* seems to be scribal error.[102] The unique
shortened form -*š* after a case-ending (*nidnu-š*) is also
difficult to explain.[103]

3fs: -*ši* occurs twice: DUMU-*ši* 3:86:24; DUMU.MEŠ-*ši*

        3:94:r10'; -*sa* is more frequent: DUMU.MEŠ-*sa* 3:

        66:4,7; 3:114:29; 3:129:17; 3:137:16; 3:159f.:

        5,[104] 19,23; ^LÚ*mu-ti-sa* (gen.) 5:5:8'; ŠEŠ(*ahī*)-*s*⌈*a*⌉

---

[102]Perhaps -*šu* was intended; the only basic difference
between the two signs in this text is a single vertical:
the form in question is ⊿𒑱; for *ŠU*, cf. *l.*11: 𒑱.
However, note that -*sa* occurs several times for the 3fs in
other texts (see below).

[103]In native MB, the shortened form is rare, and occurs
with one exception only in literary texts; cf. Aro, *SMbG*,
54. In MA, -*š* is fairly common as an acc. suffix (i.e., on
verbs), but not as a gen. (on nouns); cf. Mayer, *UGMa*, 31, 33.

[104]Nougayrol's transliteration has -*ša*, a typographical
error.

5:173:3; ŠEŠ(ahā)-š[a] ibid.:14; ^{GIŠ}šē-er-di-ša

*Sy*18:251:7, cf. 8,9; in one text the m. suffix

is used:[105] *mar-ši-it-šu* "her property" 3:110a:

11; ^{LÚ}*mu-ti-šu* "her husband" ibid.:10 (and cf.

12); otherwise *-ša* always occurs: e.g., *e-mu-ša*

3:53a:22; *ši-ir-ki-ša* 3:70:10 (and cf. 8,9);

^{LÚ}*mu-ut-ša* (nom.) 3:65a:21,26; *Sy*18:254:16;

bi-it-ša (gen.!?[106]) 3:53b:15; and 12 other

times.[107]

Thus, *-ša* is the most frequent form of the suffix.

Whether the a-vowel represents good Akk., or an underlying

dialect form, is of course impossible to determine. The

reason for the *s* in *-sa* (and the unique 3ms *-su*, above) is

not clear;[108] note that *-ša* occurs after a dental, whereas

-sa always follows a vowel. The rare *-ši* is presumably a

levelling through of the native Akk. acc. suffix, as in K

(where *-ši* predominates; see pp. 31f.); however, note that

---

[105]The m. suffix is also used for the 3fs acc. in this
text (see below); also, the 3fs verb has the same prefix as
the m. (vs. normal *t-* in U; see below, pp. 228f.). The
stative, however, is *ṣa-kà-at* (*l.*6). The use of m. for f.
suffixes is common at Nuzi; cf. Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 39f.

[106]The sentence is *a-na ša-ak-ni₇ bi-it-ša ta-na-din-šu*
"She may give it to her 'major-domo'(?)." It is unlikely
that *bi-it-ša* is the direct object here.

[107]3:56:24; 3:65a:20,27; 3:60b:17; 3:62:14; 3:55:22,
23,24,25; 3:110b:8; 3:146f.:5,11.

[108]Other confusions of *s* and *š* are cited above, pp.
189f.

-*ši* occurs only once as an acc. suffix in U, vs. -*ša* three times (see below).

   1p: *a-bi-ni* 4:294:3; DUMU.KIN-*ni* ibid.:10; EN-*ni* 3: 114:20(bis).

   2mp(?) or dual(?):   *muh-hi-ku-ni* *5:145f.:21, refer-ring to two persons.[109]

   3mp: *ip-ṭe-ri-šu-nu* *3:19:15; *ṭe-em-šu-nu* 3:60a:13; *pil-ku-šu-nu* 3:142a:7; KÙ.BABBAR-*pu-šu-nu* 3:103: 14.

   3fp: *gáb-ba mi-[li]m(?)-⌈mi⌉-ši-na* 5:13:4, referring to two women.

d. Accusative Suffixes.

   1s: *iṣ-ṣa-bat-an-ni* *5:112:13'; *ik-šu-da-ni* 5:87:24.

   On the broken writing in the first example, see above, pp. 176f. The second example is from a poorly written text. The verb is probably 3ms, but could be 3fp (subject *elep-pētu?*). The reference is included here because *kašādu* usually takes the acc.; however, the dat. is also possible.[110]

---

[109]See W.L. Moran, "The Dual Personal Pronouns in West Peripheral Akkadian," *BASOR* 211 (1973), 50ff. Moran takes *muhhīkuni* as a 2m dual, noting (p. 52) that the acc. -*kunu* two lines later does not indicate that -*kuni* is a mistake. However, it must be remembered that this scribe made many errors (see above, p. 165, n. 3), among them twice writing -*nu* for -*ni* (*ll.*8,11), which suggest that the opposite in-version is also possible.

[110]See the discussion below, p. 200, n. 124.

2ms: KÚR-*ru-ka* *5:141:6; etc.

2fs: KÚR-*ru-ki* 5:148:8; *li-ši-bu-ki* ibid.:10.[111]

3ms: *id-din-šu* 3:109a:8, and p.; *lu-še-ri-ib-š[u]* 5:
98:r4'; [*i*n]*a-al-ta-pár-šu* 4:294:11; *il-ta-kán*[an]*-šu*
3:134:11; *il-ták-na-aš-šu*[112] 3:140:5; *li-ra-hi-*
iṣ-šu 3:76a:9,13; *ir-ku-uš-šu* 3:55:6; [*i*]*r-ku-*
uš-sú 5:3:5; *iṣ-ṣa-bat(?)-šu* *5:111:B4'; etc.

Concerning the contact of final dentals and sibilants
with the pronoun, see above, p. 189. Note that the only
example of -*su* is due to that contact; all other examples
are -*šu*. There are no instances of the short form -*š*, like
the one in the gen. suffixes.[113]

3fs: *i-hu-uz-ši* 3:76a:8; *i-hu-uz-ša* Sy18:253:14;
ú-za-ak-k[i]-ša ibid.:9; [*i*]*-ze-'-er-ša* 3:55:18;
ú-za-ak-ki-šu 3:110a:8.[114]

On the contact of the final dental and -*š* in the first
two examples, see above, p. 189. In the examples there are
three instances of -*ša*, one of -*ši*. The number is unfor-

---

[111]For *li-iš-la-mu-ki* ibid.:9, see below under dat.
suffixes.

[112]On the ventive, see below, pp. 237ff.

[113]For FN *ilteqē-ša* "FN took it(m.)" 3:64:4f., see
below, p. 315 and n. 537.

[114]Note also *ú-⌈ru⌉ (??)-ur-šu* ibid.:7, which Nougayrol
translates: "l'a dévêtue," on the basis of Hebrew ᶜ*rr*.
However, the form and meaning of this word must remain in
doubt.

tunately too small to draw any conclusions concerning the
predominant form of this suffix in U. Nevertheless, it is
interesting to note that acc. -*ša* does not occur in K, and
gen. -*ša* only once there; in U -*ša* occurs more often in
both functions. The example with m. -*šu* for "her" is in
the text in which -*šu* is also used for 3fs gen. (see above).

> 1p: *it-ep-šu-na-a-ši*[115] "they did (an evil thing) to
>   us" 5:88:31.

epēšu often takes a double acc.,[116] and so the exam-
ple has been listed here; however, it is possible that the
suffix is dat. Originally the dat. suffix,[117] -*nâši* is
also used for the acc. in MB.[118]

> 2mp: KÚR-*ru-ku-nu* *5:145f.:23.[119]

> Note that the form is Ass., vs. Bab. -*kunūti*.

> 3mp: L: [*ú/ut*]-*te-er-šu-nu-ti* *6:3:21, and cf. 23,
>   27,29, all -*šu-nu-ti*; *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* *3:5:
>   16,25, but also *at-ta-din-šu-nu* ibid.:24; *ad-
>   din-šu-nu-ma* EA45:18.[120]

---

[115]On the broken writing, see above, p. 177.

[116]Cf. *AHw*, 226a (*epēšu* G I 8). Another double acc.
with *epēšu* occurs in 3:45b:4ff., quoted below, p. 362.

[117]Cf. *GAG* §42j.

[118]Aro, *SMbG*, 57, contrary to *GAG* §42e.

[119]See above, under gen. suffixes 2mp, and n. 109.

[120]It is possible that this is a dat. suffix; the text

J: *ik-ta-ša-ad-šu-nu-ti* 3:97f.:21;[121] otherwise

always *-šunu*: e.g., in the same text, *i-šak-kán-*

šu-nu *l.*35; *iddin/ittadin-šu-nu* p. (e.g., 3:48a:

6); *ile/aqqe-šu-nu* p. (e.g., ibid.:20); *ú-ra-ṣí-*

ip-šu-nu 3:125:12 (and cf. 13); and three other

times: 3:53a:26; 3:82:18; 3:84:12.

The three letters with examples are unfortunately not

enough on which to base any conclusions; still, it is note-

worthy that *-šunūti*, which is surprisingly rare in J, pre-

dominates.[122] The reason for this divergence in the text

types is not clear. Note that no change (to *-ss-*) occurs

at the morpheme boundary in *iktašad-šunūti* (see above, p.

189).

3fp: only]*(-)ši-na-ti* in *6:3:39(L); the form could

just as easily be the anaphoric pronoun.

e. Dative Suffixes.

These are quite rare. With one or two exceptions,

they are confined to the letters, and to 1s and 2ms.

1s: *ta-aš-pu-ra* 3:4:10; *šu-bi-la-mi* *3:5:12; *tal-*

tap-ra *3:19:5; *šu-up-ra-a⌈m-mi/a⌉* *5:142:13;

---

is too broken to recover whole sentences.

[121]Probably also, in the same text, *l.*22: *id-du-uk-*
šu-nu-t⌈i⌉(?). What remains of the last sign is ⟋;
Nougayrol read it as *m⌈a(?)⌉*; however, *t⌈i⌉* is equally pos-
sible; cf. the *TI* in the previous line.

[122]Note that the examples with *-šunu* are both on *nadānu*,
which in U always takes that form of the suffix.

i-na-di-nu-ni ibid.:20; *lil-li-ku-ni* ibid.:28,

but in the same text, *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* l.18;

note also *šu-up-r[a-a]n(?)-ni*[123] 5:87f.:35 (*il-*

la-ka-an-ni in the same text, l.29, is diffi-

cult[124]); *šu-bi-la-an-ni* *6:12:10; *li-din-an-ni*[125]

EA49:21; *id-na-an-ni* ibid.:23.

It is of course difficult to distinguish between the

related nuances "to me" and "here" that the 1s dat./ventive

suffix conveys. Therefore most examples of the suffix in

sentences in which no other dative (i.e., *ana* plus a noun)

occurs,[126] have been included above. The use of the 1s

acc. (*-anni*) as a dative, which occurs here as often as the

simple ventive, is know elsewhere in WPA[127] (though not in

---

[123]There may not be enough room for *AN*: 𒀭 𒈫 𒌅𒍣; the verb must be sg., however.

[124]This form and *ik-šu-da-ni* ibid.:24, in which the suffix is probably acc., but could be dat. (see above), must be considered together. The text is poorly written. The scribe seems to move from sg. to pl. verbs at random. the verbs in question are probably 3ms, even though the subject in each case is most likely *eleppētu* (f. pl.) "ships." If they are 3ms, the suffixes are both *-anni* (the one in l.29 for the dat. 1s: "they(?) came(!) to me"; the other probably for the acc. 1s: "they (did not) reach me"). Both verbs could also be 3fp. This is less likely, but if so, either of the endings could be a simple ventive (with *-anni* for *-āni* in l.29); or they could represent *-ā-nni*, i.e., the acc. suffix, for *-āninni*, a phenomenon found at Nuzi (Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 40) and Alalakh (Giacumakis, *AkkAl*, 33).

[125]On the broken writing, see above, pp. 176f.

[126]E.g., *il-tap-ra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka* "My lord has written (hither) to your servant" *3:5:9f. See the additional discussion under the ventive, below, pp. 237ff.

[127]Often in Amarna texts (cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 27f.);

K[128]). Perhaps it is a result of the confusion of other dat. and acc. suffixes;[129] or perhaps the simple ventive was felt to be an insufficient marker for the ls dat.: note that -*anni*/-*ninni* never implies simply motion to a point opposite the speaker (i.e., the ventive), but always a ls suffix, either acc. or dat.

In three instances, the ls dat. suffix is replaced by *ana* (*ša*) *yâši*: *Sy*18:249:5; *3:19:19; **EA*47:17; i.e., when *ana* plus the independent dative pronoun occurs, the dative suffix does not.

> 2ms: *šak-na-ak-k*[*u*] 5:98:13; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* ibid.:
> r20'; [*ul-te-b*]*íl-ak-ku*[130] 5:100:r3'.

As in the K texts,[131] the distinction between acc. -*ka* and dat. -*ku* is maintained, and the dat. always occurs with the ventive.

> 2fs: probably *li-iš-la-mu-ki* "may (the gods) be
> friendly to you" 5:148:9.[132]

Unlike the 2ms dat., the pronoun here is not affixed

---

also at Mari (cf. Finet, *ALM* §17g, p. 33).

[128]See above, p. 33.

[129]Cf. *GAG* §42e.

[130]On the broken writing, see above, pp. 176ff.

[131]See above, pp. 32, 34.

[132]The verb is probably *salāmu* (*i-i*), in spite of the sibilant, and the vowel class; see below, pp. 232f., n. 251.

to the ventice.

3ms: [a]t-ta-ad-na-šu 3:83:28; perhaps]iq-te-bu-ú-šu

*6:3:16.[133]

Note that the ventive is used in one case (as with

2ms), but not in the other (cf. 2fs).

1p: On it-ep-šu-na-a-ši 5:88:31, see above under

acc. suffixes.

3mp: On ad-din-šu-nu-ma EA45:18, see above under acc.

suffixes.

2. *Other Pronouns*

a. The Anaphoric Pronoun.

Included here are the third person independent pro-

nouns.[134] In one instance, the nom. form, meaning simply

"that" (i.e., not referring to a person), may be used in-

dependently as the subject of a clause; the text is broken,

however:] šu-ú HA.LA-šu "That is his portion" 6:48b:7'.[135]

Of course, when used independently, the demonstrative and

personal pronouns are identical not only in form, but in

function as well. Apart from the example just cited, the

---

[133]At the end of an otherwise broken line; for Nougay-
rol's reading (as a prec.), see below, p. 232, n. 249.

[134]See the brief discussion in Part I, pp. 34f.

[135]Note that here the pronoun--the logical subject of
the sentence--precedes the nominal predicate, contrary to
normal Akk usage. This occurs elsewhere in U; see pp. 298f.

demonstrative occurs only attributively, and only modifying

ms nouns (undoubtedly by doincidence).[136]   As in Part I,

the rest of the demonstratives (dem.) and the personal

forms (pers.) are listed separately.

<blockquote>
ms dem.:   nom.: A.ŠÀ.HI.A šu-ú 3:124:15; [A].ŠÀ.MEŠ

šu-ut 5:264:11; KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ šu-ut 5:177:

15; gen.-acc. A.ŠÀ.MEŠ šu-wa-ti 3:96:15;

3:146:13; É.HI.A ša-šu 3:84:10; ANŠE ša-a-šu

*6:12:17; pîl-ka ša-a-[šu(?)][137] 6:32a:12f.;

di-na ša-a-[x][138] *5:142:16.

pers.:   nom.: šu-ú 3:82:20; 3:85:15;[139] dat.: a-na

šu-wa-ti Sy18:250:26; a-na ša-šu-ma 3:92:18.

fs pers.:   nom.: ši-it 3:86:23.

mp pers.:   nom.: šu-nu 3:97f.:20,24; EA45:17; *6:3:19;

šu-nu-ma 5:10:23.
</blockquote>

There are unfortunately too few attestations to draw

any conslusions about the sg. personal pronouns in the nom.

It is unlikely that only f. šît (Ass.) and m. šû (Bab.) oc-

curred. Note that both šû and šût occur as demonstratives.

136In *6:3:39,](-)ši-na-ti could be an independent
(anaphoric or personal) pronoun (acc.), or an acc. suffix.

137What is seen after ša- is ⌐⫣ .

138What is seen after ša- is ⎍⎍⎍. Nougayrol proposes
-a[(?)-š]i(?); however, there seems to be too little remaining
to rule out -a-[šu] entirely.

139In 3:172b:3', read probably ki-i-šu-ma "likewise"
(see below, p. 277), vs. Nougayrol's ki-i šu-ma "ainsi est-
il."

The oblique examples show that for both dat. and gen.-acc.,
either *šâšu* (formally dat.) or *šuwâti* (formally gen.-acc.)
could occur. This is a common phenomenon after the OB per-
iod.[140] *šâšu* is Bab., while *šuwâti* is probably Ass.[141]

b.   For the demonstrative adjective *annû*, note the fol-
lowing examples:

>   ms nom.: *an-nu-û* 3:161a:16; gen.: *an-ni-i* 3:117:
>
>   rll; acc.: *an-na-a* 3:137:14; fs acc.: *an-ni-ta*
>
>   5:87:26; mp nom.: *an-nu-û-tu* 6:45:27; fp acc.:
>
>   *an-na-ti* 3:145:27; etc.

Agreement of the noun and adjective is discussed below,
pp. 314f. Rarely, *annû* occurs without a noun, although
not as a true neuter pronoun "this"; the noun has simply
been deleted: e.g., *an-nu-tu...ṣamatū* "these (grants) are
transferred..." 3:90b:12, referring to the objects listed
in the previous lines.

c.   No interrogative pronouns are attested in texts
found at Ras Shamra, but several examples occur in the *EA*
texts; note: *mi-na-a* (acc.?) "what?" ***EA*47:25, and adver-
bial *am-mīni* (from *ana mīnim*) "why?": *am-mi-ni-im-ma EA*45:15;

---

[140]*GAG* §41c, where it is also noted that in MB the
dat. form predominates, as here.

[141]According to *AHw*, 1255f. (if the citations are re-
presentative), the writing *šu-wa-ti* occurs in OA, and at
Alalakh (*AT* 3:42, MB level) and Boghazkoy. It is also at-
tested in texts from Amurru (e.g., *PRU* 4:268:46; *EA*166:28),
and from Byblos (e.g., *EA*85:72-*šu-wa-at*; *EA*138:117-*šu-wa-ti*).

am-mi-ni-mi ibid.:23; *am-mi-ni*₇ **EA46:7.

d. Indefinite Pronouns.

i. *personal*

Only one personal indefinite pronoun is attested in the letters: *šumma urram šēram ma-an-nu-um-me-e ša šarrutta ina libbi GN eppaš* "if in future (there is) someone who exercises kingship in GN" *6:3:24ff.[142] Note the similar use of *amīlu mamma* in a legal text: [šu]mma urra [šēra] amīlu mâm-ma ša ila[qqe] eqlēti ištu qāti PN "if in future (there is) someone who would take the fields from PN" 5:7:2'ff. In another legal text, *mannum-mê* is twice modified by a prepositional phrase, and thus separated from *ša*: *ma-an-nu-um-me-e ina libbīšunu ša izziz ina dīni itti FN ū ša uqallil FN ummašunu* "anyone among them who would stand in court against (lit.: with) FN, or treat FN their mother disrespectfully" *Sy*18:249f.:16ff.; *u ma-an-nu-um-me-e ina libbīšunu ša ukabbit FN* "but anyone among them who honors FN" ibid.:24f.

Once, *mannum-mê* occurs as the (general) relative itself, i.e., without *ša* (as in the above examples);[143] the

---

[142] Perhaps also *mannum-ma*, as Nougayrol restores in the next clause of the same text: *u šumma [ma-an-n]u-ma ušam-raṣūšunūti* "and if someone(?) maltreats them" *6:3:27. However, the pl. verb (or subjunctive?; see below, p. 313) renders this restoration only a possibility at best.

[143] When followed by *ša*, the pronouns cannot be considered general relatives, but merely the (indefinite) antecedents of *ša*. For *mannum-mê* as a relative elsewhere, see

'text is unfortunately damaged, yet the reading is quite cer-

tain: [ma-an-nu-u]m-mê-e ištu awāte [annāt]i inakkir[144]

"(May DN destroy) whoever disputes these words" 3:108:19f.

Apart from these examples, the indefinite personal pro-

nouns always occur with negatives,[145] in prohibitions, mean-

ing "no one." There are four forms; in order of decreasing

frequency, they are: *mamman*, *mamma*, *mannum-ma*, *mannum-mê*.[146]

Note that *mannum-ma* does not occur at all in K, while *man-

num-mê* is never used there with a negative. When they are

used independently, all four forms are interchangeable. As

AHw, 603b (*mannummê* 2); and cf. the following sentence in
a text probably written at Boghazkoy; the main clause is
introduced by *u* (of "apodosis"): *mannum-mê ana ili šâšu
niqî ša tapputti eppaš u qîšâti ma'diš ubbal* "Whoever makes
offerings of association to that god must bring gifts greatly"
PRU 4:223:37ff.

[144]Nougayrol proposes the following: [ša mi-nu-u]um-mê-e
...i-na-qî-ir "[quiconque], de [ces] paroles, détruirait
quelque chose." In part he bases the reading of the verb on
liqqur in *l*.19; and that determines his understanding of the
sentence, and his choice of pronoun. But since *naqāru* is an
a-u verb, as *liqqur* itself shows, it is more likely that the
verb in question is *nakāru* (*i-i*) "to be hostile," which can
also mean "to dispute, deny" (cf. *AHw*, 719a, *nakāru* I G 5;
note also 5:95:31 in K). Since *nakāru* only rarely takes an
object, the pronoun in question is probably the subject of
inakkir, i.e., *mannum-mê* "whoever." (For *mannum-mê* as a
relative, without *ša*, see n. 143, above.) Since *mannum-mê*,
if correct here, would be the subject of its clause, it is
in the correct case. In Nougayrol's interpretation, *mînum-
-mê* would be governed by the syntax of the main clause, and
the acc. *mînam-mê* would be expected.

[145]A possible exception may occur in 3:166:rl0':]a-na
LÚ ma-an-ni-mi-i [; the context is too broken to recover it.

[146]*mamman* occurs about 60 times, *mamma* about 15; *man-
num-ma* is found eight times, and *mannum-mê* only three (in
addition to 3:108:19, note: 3:64b:13; 3:75b:8; 3:166:rl0';
possibly also 3:76b:11).

examples of the same clause ("In future no one may take (it/them) from PN"), note:

> *ú-ra-am še-ra-am ma-am-ma-an la i-le-qè iš-tu* ŠU-*ti PN* 3:49a:15ff.

> *ú-ra še-ra ma-am-ma la i-laq-qé-šu iš-tu* ŠU *PN* 3:77:9ff.

> *ur-ra-am še-ra-am ma-an-nu-um-ma la-a i-la-qè-šu iš-tu qa-ti PN* 3:159a:12ff.

> *ú-ra-am še-ra-am ma-nu-um-me-e la-a il-qè-šu*[147] *iš-tu* ŠU-*ti PN* 3:64b:12ff.

While the choice of one form over another may at times have depended on the individual scribe, not even this is always true, for in some texts, more than one occurs: e.g., *mamman* and *mannum-ma* in 3:46:14,21; 3:52f.:7,27; 5:15:r3',12'.

Quite often, the pronoun occurs in apposition, always modifying *amīlu* (cf. 5:7:2'ff., quoted above). Once, in a broken context, the form used is *mannum-mê*:]*a-na* LÚ *ma-an-ni-mi-i*[148] 3:166:r10'. Note that in this example, the only one in which *mannum-ma* and *mannum-mê* are not nom.,[149] the pronoun is correctly declined. *amīlu mamma* is attested three times in the corpus: 3:82:14; 3:148a:16; 5:7:3'. Otherwise, only *mamman* occurs with *amīlu*, at least 25 times:[150]

------

[147]On the use of the pret. here, see below, pp. 245ff.

[148]For *mannim-mê*; the lack of distinction between *i* and *e* was discussed above, pp. 177ff.

[149]*mamman* and *mamma* are of course indeclinable: e.g., *a-na* LÚ *ma-am-ma* 3:82:14.

[150]*amīlu mamma(n)*, as opposed to *mamma(n)* alone, is found much more frequently in texts from the reigns of the later kings, especially Ammistamru II. However, there are no hard and fast rules of distribution.

e.g., *ur₅-ra še-ra* LÚ *ma-am-ma-an la i-la-qé-šu iš-tu* ŠU PN 6:29:22ff. In none of the examples, including this last cited, is there any obvious difference in meaning between *mamma(n)* and *amīlu mamma(n)*.

Once, *mamma*, reinforced(?) by *mimma*, occurs *before amīlu*: *ma-am-ma mi-im-ma* LÚ-*lu₄ a-na* UGU LÚ-*lu₄*[151] *la-a i-ra-gu-um* "No one at all may contest against anyone (else)" 3:54a:13ff.

ii. *impersonal*

The only impersonal indefinite pronoun found in the letters is *mīnum-mê*, which occurs only before *šulmānu*. The examples are *mi-nu-um-me-e šul-ma-nu* 5:148:r8'; [*mi*]-*nu-me-e šul-ma-ni* *5:137:19.[152] The expression means "whatever/all well-being." In the first example, the pronoun is in apposition to the noun, while in the second, it is a nomen regens.[153]

In the legal texts, *mīnum-mê*, *mimma*, *mimmam*, and *mimmam-ma* occur. None is found as a relative pronoun,[154] but the first does serve twice as an antecedent for *ša* in inde-

---

[151]On the incorrect case-ending, see below, p. 218, n. 192.

[152]Note also, in the poorly written *5:145f., *mi-nu-mê-e šul-ma-na* (*ll.7f.) and *mi-nu-me-e šul-ma-ni* (*ll.26f.).

[153]In the possibly K text **4:196f., as well, both constructions are present: *mīnum-mê hašihtašu* (acc.) in *l.10; *mīnum-mê šulmāni* in *ll.6f.

[154]The possibility that *mimmam* is so used, in 3:66a: 9ff., is suggested below.

finilte relative constructions; once, it is independent:

mi-nu-um-me-e ša ibašši ana yâši ša tartêši FN "anything

that belongs to me that FN has acquired" *Syl*8:249:5ff.; in

the other example, it is in apposition to a string of nouns:

u mi-nu-um-me-e maršîtšu bîtšu eqlêtu gabba mimmûša ša iršû

ana PN "And any/all property, estate, fields, everthing of

hers(!) that she acquired, belongs to PN" 3:110a:11ff. Note

also the following economic text, where no relative clause

follows: 17 GIŠ[   ]-*na ir-te û(?)* GIŠ *ša-x-x-ma û(?) mi-nu-*

*me-e*MEŠ GIŠ.MEŠ "17 (logs?) of ...wood and wood of ... and

all (other) wood" 6:95c:4ff.[155]

Apart from the expression *mimma šumšu* (see below),

mimma and the variants *mimmam*[156] and *mimmam-ma*[157] occur ten

times,[158] with no obvious difference in meaning between them.

In five examples, they are used attributively, in apposition

---

[155]Another occurrence of *mînum-mê* is in a broken con-
text:]*mi-nu-um-m[e-e* 3:66:18.

[156]The two occurrences of this, in 3:66a:6,9, are appa-
rently unique in Akk.; cf. *CAD* M/2, 73ff.

[157]The form *mimma-ma*, which is not attested in U, occurs
very rarely in OA, OB and SB. It is somewhat more common in
peripheral texts, especially from Mittanni (cf. *EA*27:15; *EA*29:
64,29,161). But *mimmam-ma*, which occurs in 3:150b:5', is
found otherwise only in *EA*170:7, an Amurru letter (and pre-
sumably also in *EA*167:16, also from Amurru: *mi-im-ma-a[m-ma]*).
Cf. *CAD* M/2, 79f. (*mimma* h).

[158]All the examples are quoted in this and the next
paragraph. Note also possibly the following: in independ-
ent use: [*mi-im(?)*]-*ma-a ina libbîšun[u u]l(?)*... "Not(?)
anything at all(?) in their midst..." 3:57:22; in apposition:
[*di-n]a mim(?)-[ma...]* "(not?) any(?) case(?)" 3:98:33.

after a noun:[159] *pilku mim-ma yānu* "There is no feudal ser-
vice" 3:116:r9'; cf. 3:142a:7; 6:45:26; *šipra* [*mi*]*m-ma lā
eppušū* "They are not obliged to perform any service" 3:166:
48'f.; once, in apposition to a personal indefinite pronoun:
mamma mi-im-ma amīlu ana muhhi amīlu(!) lā iraggum "No one
at all may contest against anyone (else)" 3:54a:13ff. A
similar example may be *m*[*amma(n)*]*(?) mim-ma ul ubaqq*[*ar*] in
6:34b:r2'f., if the meaning is "No one(?) at all may com-
plain"; but it is more likely that *mimma* here is used inde-
pendently, as an adverbial acc.: "No one(?) may complain at
all." Another example of independent, adverbial use is:
mārū PN u būlašu u NÍ.GU₄ *u gabba mimmûsu...mi-im-ma lā uṣṣi*
"PN's sons, cattle, property, everything...will not go out
at all" 3:114:23ff.

In two examples, the syntax is difficult to determine
with certainty. One is: [*mi-i*]*m-ma-am eli* FN... *lā ittaz-
zamūni* 3:66a:6ff. It is possible that here too *mimmam* is an
adverbial acc.: "They may not complain at all against FN..."
But when used adverbially, the pronoun usually stands imme-
diately before (*lā* and) the verb, as in the above examples.[160]
Thus, perhaps it is the direct object:[161] "They may not
complain about anything..." *mimmam* may also serve as direct

---

[159]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 77f. (*mimma* b 2').

[160]Cf. also the examples in *CAD* M/2, 75a (*mimma* a 2'
b').

[161]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 74f. (*mimma* a 2' a').

object in the other difficult clause, from the same text:

[mi-i]m-ma-am [itt]i FN...i/uza''izūni ibid.:9ff. Note that
this is the only example in which *mimma* and its variants do
not occur with a negative. If *mimmam* is the direct object,
the sentence must be translated: "Everything was divided
with FN..." But another possibility is that the pronoun is
a relative,[162] and that the main clause verb is lost in the
lacuna that follows: "Anything that was divided with FN...,
..." The final example is in a broken context:]mi-im-
m[a-a]m-ma : mu- 𒄷 [3:150b:5'.

A variant form of the idiom *mimma šumšu* "everything,
anything"[163] occurs three times: *mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu* (acc.) 3:
101:3; *gáb-bu mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu* (acc.) 3:68:5; *ga-ab-bi*
[mi]-im-mī *šum-ši-ša* (acc.) 3:146b:5. These examples are the
only times the pronoun stands before a noun; it functions as
a bound form, since *šumšu*, taken by the scribes as a declina-
ble noun to which a new suffix could be added, is always in
the gen. The reason for the final -*i* vowel, instead of the
expected -*a* is not clear.[164]

iii. The pronoun *mimmû* is always preceded by *gabbu*, as it
is in K.[165] Unlike K, however, *mimmû* is sometimes declined

---

162Cf. *CAD* M/2, 78b (*mimma* d 1').

163Cf. *CAD* M/2, 75 (*mimma* b 1' a' 1").

164*mimmi* occurs elsewhere only in the Amarna correspon-
dence; cf. *CAD* M/2, 79 (*mimma* g).

165See above, pp. 40f.

in U. Two forms occur in these texts: *mimmû*, with or without a pronominal suffix, and *mimmî-*, always with a suffix. In the letters, only *mimmû* (without a suffix) is attested, even though always in the gen. For examples of the rather peculiar distribution of these possibilities, see section e, below.

iv.   The form *ayyānum-ma*, which occurs once in K, is not attested in U.

e. *gabbu*.

The normal word for "all" is again *gabbu; kalû* does not occur. The following are all the constructions with the word that are exhibited in the texts:

    nom.: L: *gab-bu* ERIN₂.MEŠ 5:87:20;

             gab-bu ⌈GIŠ⌉MÁ⌉.MEŠ-[i]a ibid.:22;

             [ga]b-bu DUMU.MEŠ 5:82:a

             gab-ba DINGIR.MEŠ 5:148:7;

        J: *gab-bu* 5:174:31;

           gáb-bu mim-mu(-šu) 3:82:23;[166] 3:141:23;

           gáb-bu mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu 3:68:5;[167]

---

[166]The defective writing of the final long -*û*, when no suffix follows, is peculiar.

[167]According to Nougayrol's translation, this should be acc. The sentence must be quoted in full: *ištu ūmi annîm RN šar GN inaddin bīt PN₁ mār PN₂* A.ŠÀ.HI.A-*šu* ᴳᴵˢGEŠTIN-*šu* ᴳᴵˢGI.DÌM.HI.A-*šu* GIŠ.ŠAR(KIRI₆)-*šu gáb-bu mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu nadin ana PN₃*. Nougayrol translates: "A dater d'aujourd'hui, [RN], roi de [GN], donne la maison de [PN₁] fils de [PN₂], sa terre, sa vigne, son oliveraie, son verger, et toute (autre)

         gab-ba 5:173:17,21;

         gáb-ba 3:102:16;

         gáb-ba mim-mu-šu 3:110a:12;

         gáb-bá mim-mu-ú-šu 3:114:24;

         gáb-ba mim-mu-ia 5:11:7.

gen.: L: *gab-bi mim-mu-ú* 3:4:7; 5:87:8; 5:98:7; 5:100: 5; *6:2:7;*[168]

        [*a-na(?) g*]*áb-bi* ᴸᵁDUMU.KIN-*ri* **EA47:14;

        gab-ba : mim-mu-ú *5:137:16f.;

    J: *gab-bi mim-mu* 3:33a:5;[169]

        gab-bi mim-mu-(-ú)-šu 3:118:10f.,14, and often;[170]

        gáb-bi mi-im-mi-šu 3:52b:16; 3:67b:5; 3:92:5;[171]

        gáb-bi mim-mi-šu 3:112b:11; cf. 3:85:9;

        ga-ab-bi [*mi*]-*im-mì šum-ší-ša* 3:146b:5;

        gáb!-ba šu-ku-na 3:103:18.

acc.: J: *gáb-bá* 3:172b:5';

---

chose. Il le donne à [PN₃]." First of all, it is assumed here that *nadin* is passive, since there is no reason to take it as an active (note, e.g., *nidnu annû nadin* 3:165:14; and elsewhere). Secondly, I would divide the sentences after PN₂: "Henceforth, RN, king of GN, gives the estate of PN₁, son of PN₂. His field,..., everything of his, is given to PN₃."

[168]If *gab-bi* [*mim-m*]*a(?)-ú* in 5:81:6' is correctly restored, I am unable to explain it.

[169]See n. 166, above.

[170]3:113:8; 3:117:obv9'f.; 3:119:8,12,14; 3:135b:8,11; 3:143f.:6,10,12,15,18,23,26; 3:148a:6; 3:148b:5; 3:152:10; 3:168a:4; 6:31:9; 6:33:10,15.

[171]Note also *gáb<-bi> mi-im-mi-šu-nu* 3:58b:5; [*qadu gabbi m*]*i-im-me-e-šu* 3:100:6.

$g\acute{a}b$-$b\acute{a}$ mi-im-mi-$\check{s}u$ 3:48b:4; 3:53b:5; 3:60b:5; 3:71a:7,15;

$g\acute{a}b$-$b\acute{a}$ mi-$i[m$-$m]i$-$\check{s}i$-na 5:13:4;

$g\acute{a}b$-$b\acute{a}$ A.ŠÀ.MEŠ 3:97:5.

acc.(?): J: $g\acute{a}b$-bu [3:58a:4;[172]

$g\acute{a}b$-bi SUM.MEŠ-ti 3:120:r3'.[173]

unclear: L]gab-ba a-ma-te^{MEŠ}-ia[*6:3:36,38.

As these examples show, there is the same confusion in U as there is in K,[174] with regard both to the final vowel on $gabbu$, and to the case of the following word. With the exception of the last three examples, which are found in broken contexts, the observations that were made about the construction of $gabbu$ in K hold for U as well. Thus, in 43 examples of constructions in the nom. and gen., $gabbu$ is declined, deriving its case from its context; in nine others, the frozen form $gabba$ is used; in the acc., of course, $gabba$ should occur either way.[175] Note that the (pro)noun occurs five times independently, meaning "everything"; in one of the instances in which it is nom., the declined form $gabbu$ is found, while in the others, we have $gabba$.

---

[172]There is some possibility that the form is nom., but this seems less likely, given what remains of the context. However, see the commentary below.

[173]The context is broken here too. It is possible, though again less likely, that the construction is gen.; see the commentary below.

[174]See above, pp. 41f.

[175]This renders the two examples in broken contexts somewhat more suspicious.

When *gabbu* occurs with another noun, we are hampered
in discerning the construction involved by the fact that the
second element is so often the pronoun *mimmû*, or a logogram.
mimmû is apparently sometimes indeclinable, as in *gabbi*
mimmû(šu) (gen.). In other instances, however, it is declined,
as in *gabbi mimmî(šu)* (gen.); here, *gabbi* may be either (a)
in apposition to the second element, which would then derive
its case from the context,[176] or (b) a bound form, with the
second element dependent on it. The latter must be the situ-
ation in the acc. *gabba mimmîšu*. In the nom. construction
gabbu mimmi šumšîšu, too, *gabbu* must be a bound form, with
mimma šumšu treated as a declinable unit dependent on it.[177]
Note that *gabbu* as a bound form is also declined, a common
phenomenon in the U texts.[178] Finally, it can only be as-
sumed that the acc. of the second element in the gen. con-
struction *gabba šukuna*[179] is a scribal error, or that the
word was diptotic.

3. *The Noun and Adjective*

a. Declension of the Unbound Form.

i.   Most nouns are correctly declined; a few examples

---

[176]The same is true of the nom. constructions *gabbu/*
gabba mimmû(šu/ya).

[177]But note also the acc. *mimmi šumšîšu*, without *gabbu*
in 3:101:3; see above, section d, ii, end.

[178]See below, pp. 220f.

[179]For this word, see *AHw*, 1266a.

will suffice to illustrate the various cases:

sg. nom.: *mar-ši-tù* 3:57:18; *ni-id-nu an-nu-ú* 3:164:
17; gen.: *i-na di-ni* 3:72a:8; *a-na* ÌR-*dì* 5:15:r3';
acc.: *ni-id-na an-na-a* 3:84:26; *di-na* 3:54a:16; pl.
nom.: ÌR.MEŠ-*dú (ardū)* 3:57:19; LÚ.MEŠ *an-nu-tu* *5:
142:28; note also LÚ.MEŠ*ú-ru-ba-nu*[180] 3:37b:7; gen.:
LÚ.MEŠ*ši-bu-ti* 3:35a:2; LÚ*na-ia-lu-ti* 5:13:6; *qa-ta-
at-ti* (for *qātāti*)[181] 3:37a:4,11; É-*ta-te* 3:147b:4;
⌈*e*⌉*q(?)-le-ti* 5:183:6'; A.ŠÀ.MEŠ *ku-ub-sa-ti* 3:48a:
10; A.ŠÀ.MEŠ *ki-na-ti* ibid.:16; *tup-pa-ti* 3:97:17.

There are several occurrences of Ugaritic plurals in *-ma*,[182]
especially in the economic texts; some examples:

nom.: *ma-qa-bu-ma*[183] 6:119:4; A.ŠÀ.MUN.HI.A : *ṣí-
ṣú-ma*[184] 3:124:14; A.ŠÀ.MUN : *ṣí-ṣú-*⌈*ú-ma*⌉[184] 6:30:
r2'; TÚG*pa-li-du-ma*[185] 6:101a:4; 6:101b:3; DUG*ka-
du-ma*[186] 6:113:7; LÚ.MEŠ*a-ši-ru-ma*[187] 3:201:III:11;

---

[180]Cf. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3, 220 (under "Gages"). Note:
correct the reference there for *urubānu* "garant" to 16.287:7.

[181]On double writings of single consonants, see pp.
175f.

[182]Cf. *UT* §8.7, p. 54.

[183]"Hammers"; cf. *mqb(m) UT* §1533, p. 437.

[184]"Salt fields"; cf. *ṣṣ UT* §2128, p. 475; Nougayrol,
PRU 3, 229; *PRU* 6, 146, n. 4; In 3:125:r4', the word occurs
with an adjective, probably in the wrong case: ⌈*i-n*⌉*a : ṣí-
ṣú-ma an-nu-tu.*

[185]A garment of some king; cf. *pld(m) UT* §2045, p. 468.

[186]A vase of some kind; cf. *kd UT* §1195, p. 417.

[187]"Supervisors"(?); cf. the verb *aθr* "to march" *UT* §424,

gen.: $^{LÚ.MEŠ}a$-$ši$-ri-ma 3:134:9; perhaps also ZI-ZA-hal-li-ma[188] 3:166a:r6'.

ii. There are, however, many more incorredt case-endings in U than in K. Far more mistakes occur in the legal texts than in the letters.[189] In the latter, however, note: sg. acc. GAL-tu 5:98:r18', and the inexplicably endless writings of $amātu$ in 5:87, quoted below, section e.[190]

As with GAL-tu, above (and cf. n. 190, end), there is a tendency in the legal texts as well to use the nom. incorrectly for nouns that should be acc. or gen.; some examples

---

p. 369. The word also occurs in Akk. in Amarna and Taanach texts; cf. *CAD* A/2, 440b.

[188]Meaning unknown; not attested in alphabetic cuneiform texts as yet.

[189]The ec. texts also contain a number of incorrect case-endings, perhaps in part due to their abbreviated format. As in the other genres, there is a tendency for the nom. to occur where the gen. or acc. are expected: e.g., $ša$ ^{LÚ}a-$ši$-ru-ma 6:96b:4, cf. 5; [$š$]a di-ba-ra-tu 6:120a:13; etc.

[190]There are two other possible mistakes in the letters. One occurs in *5:142:21ff.: $šī$$būtu$ $ša$ GN PN_1 $mār$ PN_2 PN_3 $qadu$ $mārīšu$ u PN_4 ^{LÚ}ha-at-ni-$šu$ u $akil$ lim $amīlu$ $annûtu$ lil-$likūni$ "Let the witness of GN, PN_1, son of PN_2, PN_3 with his sons(,) and PN_4 his relative, and the overseer-of-a-thousand --let these men come here." It is difficult to know if hat-$nīšu$ is governed by $qadu$ or is a new entry, in the nom. (in which case the i-vowel is incorrect). Arguing for the latter alternative are the sense, and the fact that PN's are usually declined: PN_4 is ^{I}ad-du-nu, nom.
In 5:98:r12',15'f., there occurs the expression ina $qāti$ PN ^{LÚ}ZA-ar-$GU/KU(-)IGI$-ia. If this is to be read $šar$-$quštya$, the case is correct; however, it is more likely, as Nougayrol points out (his n. 1), that $šarku$ $pantya$ is intended, in which instance, the $-u$ is incorrect. For case-endings on bound forms, see below, paragraphs b, d.

are:

      acc.: $^{L\acute{U}}ub$-ru 3:84:23; SUM.MEŠ-nu...mar-$\check{s}i$-tu_4 3:

      102:3f.;[191] gen.: i-na 2 me-te KÙ.BABBAR $k\grave{a}s$-pu 3:

      169:14.[192]

These (and in n. 191) are all in the unbound state; but mis-

takes also occur in nouns in the bound form, which in U of-

ten has case-endings even in the sg. (see below, sections b,

c):

      before a noun: acc.: É-tu_4 PN 3:52a:19'; gen.: i-na

      DUMU.MEŠ $\check{s}i$-ip-ru LUGAL 3:105:54; $p\imath l$-ka-ma $^{L\acute{U}.MEŠ}$

      mur-$\acute{u}$ $^{L\acute{U}}$MAŠKIM 3:146:14; with suffixes: acc.: $p\imath l$-

      ku-$\check{s}u$ 3:126:24; pu-hu-ka 3:51:7; gen.: a-na PN

      $^{L\acute{U}}GA$-GA-ru-$\check{s}u$[193] 3:134:23.

    There are other mistakes in case-endings as well,

though they are less common: e.g., nom. bu-la-$\check{s}u$ 3:114:23;[194]

acc. ta-ap-te-ti A.ŠÀ.HI.A-$\check{s}u$ 3:129:9. Note also [ba]-tu-

la-at 3:66:11, incorrectly without a case-ending; see sec-

tion e, below.[195]

---

    [191]Note also acc. É-tu_4 3:47a:5; 3:104:29; tup-pu an-na-am 3:105:56; A.ŠÀ.MEŠ $q\acute{a}$-al-lu 3:112a:5; 5/3 pu-ri-du_4 5:8:6,7.

    [192]Cf. also LÚ-lu_4 $i\check{s}$-tu/a-na muh-hi LÚ-lu_4 3:54:12,14. Here, however, the writing LÚ-lu_4 is perhaps to be considered a frozen form.

    [193]The meaning of this word is unknown; cf. Nougayrol's comments in PRU 3, 235.

    [194]Perhaps also in]$^{L\acute{U}}ka$-al-la la-a il-la-[ak] "A mes-senger will not go(?)" 3:150b:r7'.

    [195]For constructions with $gabbu$, see above, pp. 212ff.

iii.   The particle *umma*[196] "thus" is followed by the gen.:[197]

e.g., *um-ma* ^{I}*a-mis-tam-ri* 3:4:3.

iv.   The only instances of the locative-adverbial ending

-*u(m)* are on the frozen adverbial forms *ašrānu* and *panānu*;

see below, pp. 275ff., s.v.   Similarly, the terminative-

adverbial ending -*iš* is found only on the frozen forms

danniš, *dāriš*, *ṭābiš*, all employed as adverbs; see ibid.,

s.v.

b. The Bound Form before Nouns.

Of the sg. bound forms which occur before other nouns,

and which are written syllabically (or as logograms with

phonetic complements), only a few exhibit the shape expected

in native Akk (i.e., no final vowel, or, with some noun

types, a final *i*[198]).   They are:

> *mi-ši-il* A.ŠÀ 3:76b:6; *mê-ḫê-er* ^{NA}KIŠIB 3:97:16;
>
> A.ŠÀ.MEŠ *al-la-an PN* 3:131a:4f.; *i-na ni-is-sà-at*
>
> ŠÀ-*ša* 3:56:24; $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$*mu-de* LUGAL 3:134:12;

---

[196]See below, p. 282.

[197]Cf. R. Marcus, *JCS* 2, 223f.

[198]I.e., nouns of the type *qīštu*, *tuppu*.   The only
certain example of the former type occurs in *ši-im-ti* É-*ti-šu*
i-ši-im "He established the disposition of his estate" 5:10:
3.   According to *GAG* §64g, the bound form of *šīmtu* is usu-
ally *šīmat*; however, *šīmti* occurs in OA.   In any event, the
form here does not bear a case-ending, since it is acc.   Of
the second type, note [*tu*]*p-pu RN* 3:102:heading; cf. in ad-
dition the economic texts 3:192c:1; 6:68:1; 6:96b:1.   Also,
if ⌈*kī*⌉ -*it* ^{UZU}ŠÀ-*bi-ia* "my heart's truth(?)" **EA47:21, is
read correctly, *kit* is an example of a short form of con-
struct, also seen in MB in the variants *muh* and *muhhi*; cf.
Aro, *SMbG*, 66.

^{LÚ}šá-kín KUR-ti 3:35b:6;[199] (cf. also nn. 198 and

203).

The rest of the sg. bound forms, over three-quarters of

the occurrences, have a case-ending which would not appear

in normal Akk. In all but a few instances, the case-vowel

is the one required by context. (The errors were noted in

the previous section.) Many of the examples are nouns of

the type $pvrs$, although other types occur as well. A few

of the examples follow:

nom.: $ni-id-nu$ LUGAL 3:65b:14; cf. 3:64a:10;

$be-el-tu_4$ É 3:86:23; $^{LÚ}ha-za-nu$ URU 3:135:15;

$^{LÚ}mu-du$ LUGAL 3:82:21; 3:80:18; 3:85:16 (vs. $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$

$mu-de$ cited above); $^{LÚ}mu-du-ú$ LUGAL 3:84:20; cf. 3:

114:31; $tap-te-tu_4$ A.ŠÀ.MEŠ 3:139:19; MUNUS.LUGAL-tu_4

GN 3:51:4; $É-tu_4$[200] PN 3:104:27; $mar-ia-nu$ LUGAL 3:

80:17; cf. 3:193:24(Ec.). gen.:[201] $a-na$ $ni-id-ni$

FN 3:53a:19; $i-na$ $ši-ip-ri$ É.G[AL]$'$ 3:150b:r4'; cf.

3:68:15; $ša-a$ PN_1 : $ha-at-ni$ PN_2 3:142b:5; $iš-tu$

$pí-ki$ É PN 3:46:12; cf. 3:134:8f.; $a-na$ $šak-ni_?$

---

[199]This was probably no longer considered a bound form
plus genitive, but rather a compound noun, $šakin-māti$; cf.
AHw, 1141a ($šaknu$ B 2 a).

[200]Cf. also 3:70:21; 3:92:17,18; nom. for acc.: 3:51:10;
3:52a:18,19. The bound form of $bītu$ when it is gen. is oc-
casionally $bīti$ in native Akk.; but, if the citations in CAD
B, 282ff., are representative, the bound form in the other
cases is always $bīt$ in native Akk.

[201]The form $qa-ti$ 3:76b:12, etc., is found in native
Akk.; cf. GAG §64c; Aro, $SMbG$, 66.

bi-it-ša ta-na-din-su[202] 3:53b:15f.; acc.: píl-ka

É-šu 3:89:18f.;[203] É-ta[204] PN 3:52a:18; ú-nu-ša[205]

É.MEŠ 3:63a:17; di-na[206] FN 3:94:r3'; cf. 3:157b:7;

pu-ha[207] É-šu 6:27:r7'.

For further discussion of these forms, see the end of the next section.

As in K, there are very few m. pl. bound forms written syllabically; those that are offer no problems: e.g., a-na pa-ni RN p. (e.g., 3:71b:2). Only one clear example of a f. pl. bound form without suffixes occurs:[208] acc. ku-bu-da-ti

---

[202]It is unlikely that bītša is the object, in spite of the fact that it is not gen. The sentence should be translated: "She gave it to her major-domo(?)."

[203]Cf. also 3:78:16; 3:129:18; 3:155a:12; 6:29:30; píl-ka-ma 3:146:14.

[204]See above, n. 200.

[205]unuššu is a Ugaritic word; cf. unθ, UT §275, p. 363. It seems to correspond to Akk. (p)ilku; cf. Nougayrol, PRU 3, 227. Given all the other examples of a case-ending on the bound form, there is no need to supply ša here, as Nougayrol does.

[206]In the examples of dīnu in CAD D, 150ff., the nom.-acc. construct is dīn with only one exception, in a text from Nuzi: di-nu DI.KU5.MEŠ HSS 9:94:23 (cited p. 151b).

[207]The bound form of pūhu, in the examples in AHw, 877f., is normally pūh, in the gen. occasionally pūhi.

[208]In a-na pu-ha-at A.ŠÀ.MEŠ "as substitute for the field(s)" 3:50b:8, pu-ha-at may be pl. (pūhāt), since AHw, 876f., lists no sg. *pūhatu, and the bound form of pūhtu is apparently pūhti. However, two points indicate that the example at hand is sg.: (a) the acc. form pu-ha-ta in 3:45b: 6, which must either be a scribal error, or a sg., pūhata, a (peripheral?) by-form of pūhu/pūhtu; (b) pu-ha-at seems to refer to a single entity: what is being given as substitute

LUGAL "honorary gifts for the king" 3:99a:8. Note that
there is a case-vowel on this bound form, as there is on the
majority of sg. nouns.

c. The Bound Form with Suffixes.

The sg. bound form before suffixes also occurs both with
and without case-endings. Many of the forms which exhibit a
case-ending, however, are good native Akk.; this is true, for
instance, of all examples in the gen.; e.g.:

> a-na PN a-bi-ni 4:294:3; i-na qal-lu-ut-ti-ka *5:137:
>
> 5,8; ip-te_4-ri-$šu$-nu[209] *3:19:15.

Other nouns, such as abu and emu, are fully declined in Akk.
when they have suffixes;[210] examples of these in U are: nom.
e-mu-$ša$ 3:53a:22; a-bu-$šu$ 5:174:41; acc. a-ba-$šu$ 3:55:12.
For nouns with 1s suffix, see below.

---

is A.ŠÀ.MEŠ (l.3), which in spite of the MEŠ is referred to
in l.7 by the sg. pronoun -$šu$, and so is probably a single
field. It was noted above (pp. 172ff.) that MEŠ very often
occurs after logograms without indicating plurality. On the
other hand, it will be shown below (pp. 315f.), that sg.
pronouns are sometimes used to refer to pl. nouns, and so
the matter must remain unresolved.

[209]This form could be pl., but the sg. is more likely.

[210]GAG §65h. Von Soden also notes there that nouns of
the type $p\bar{v}s$, from $pvrs$ of roots III-weak, are also declined
when they have suffixes. Thus perhaps (acc.!) pu-hu-ka 3:
51:7, could be considered good Akk.; however, the construct
before suffixes (apart from the gen.) in the examples in
AHw, 877f., in always $p\bar{u}h$-. Similarly (nom.!) bu-la-$šu$ 3:114:
23, is the only time the construct of $b\bar{u}lu$ (apart from the
gen.), in the citations in CAD B, 313f., is not simply bul-.
Another example that may either be normal Akk., or be exhi-
biting a case-ending, is (acc.) tup-pa-ka **EA47:15,18.

When the above types are discounted, the number of examples with case-endings (incorrectly, in native Akk.) is about the same as the number of "correct" forms, in contrast to the disproportionate ratio seen in the previous section. The following are the examples with no case-ending:

be-el-$šu$ 3:46:18; 5:15:r7'; $šul$-ma-an-$šu$ **EA47:26;

mar-$ši$-it-$šu$ 3:110a:11; na-$dâ$-an-$ša$ 3:65a:20,27;

LÚmu-ut-$ša$ ibid.:21,26; (gen.!) bi-it-$ša$[211] 3:53b:

15; $ṭe_4$-em-$šu$-nu 3:60a:13.

The forms with a case-ending are:

nom.: pil-ku-$šu$-nu 3:142a:7; KÙ.BABBAR-pu-$šu$-nu 3:

103:14; ni-id-nu-$uš$[212] 3:68:12; (for acc.) pil-ku-$šu$

3:126:24; (for gen.) LÚGA-GA-ru-$šu$ 3:134a:23, cf.

l.14; acc.: pil-ka-$šu$ 3:96:15; 3:129:17; 3:132:30;

6:32a:9.

In native Akk., including MB, sg. bound forms before nouns do not normally have case-endings,[213] and sg. bound

---

[211]See above, n. 202, on p. 221.

[212]See above, p. 194, and n. 103.

[213]The fact that there is an occasional case-ending (especially on the gen.) in OAk, and in the literary dialects (especially OB) is hardly relevant here; see I.J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar (Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary 2)*, 2nd ed., (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961), 145f.; see also *GAG* §64a. Aro, *SMbG*, 66, notes that a very few construct forms in MB have an extra i. These are not case-endings, however; some occur on short words, such as $šumu$, $qātu$, which exhibit constructs in i occasionally in OB (cf. *GAG* §64c); others, such as $bēlti$ and $hazanni$, are probably due to analogies with forms like $qīštu$, $ṣibitti$. Aro also notes that some other written final vowels are due to sandhi.

forms with suffixes have them only in the gen. and in the
few noun types mentioned above. Thus, the many abnormal
forms encountered in these texts must reflect the native
language of their authors, namely Ugaritic, where the bound
form did have case-endings.[214] The only difficulty in this
assumption is with 1s suffixes on the nom., especially the
forms *a-bu-ia* 5:87:19,26, and *ṣa-bu-tu₄-ia* (probably sg.[215])
"my wish" *6:12:8. The 1s on nom. forms in Ugaritic is
simply *-ī.[216] Thus, these forms must be strictly Akk.;
perhaps the latter, which should be *ṣabûtī* in Akk., if it
is indeed sg., is formed by analogy with *abūya*.[217]

   The bound forms of pl. nouns with suffixes are regularly
declined in native Akk. Thus, as with the gen. sg. and other
forms listed in the first paragraph of this section, it is
impossible to determine whether normal Akk. forms are inten-
ded, or whether these forms too represent the morphology of
the scribes' native Ugaritic. The pl. forms are:

   pa-nu-šu-nu **EA46:10;[218] *a-ma-te*MEŠ-*šu* 5:98:r5';

   *a-ma-te*MEŠ-*ia* *6:3:36; *pa-ṭī-šu* 3:48a:11.

---

[214]Cf., for the nom.: *ksu θbth* "the throne of his sit-
ting" *UT* 51:8:12f., p. 173; acc.: *lyhpk ksa mlkk* "he will
overthrow your royal throne" *UT* 49:6:28, p. 169; gen.: *lksi
mlkh* "on his royal throne" *UT* 49:5:5, p. 169. On case-end-
ings on the bound forms in other WS dialects, see above, p.
50, n. 111.

[215]See above, 192, n. 97.   [216]*UT* §6.6, p. 36.

[217]The vocatives *be-li* 5:98:10,r13', and *a-bi* 5:87:19,
26, are good Akk.; but they could also reflect Ugaritic
morphology.

[218]The form LÚ*ab-ba-e-ia* (i.e., *abbā'ēya*) **EA46:9, is
Ass.; cf. similar O/MA forms (nom.) in *AHw*, 7b.

d. The Absolute State.

A few unbound nouns occur without case-endings: [itt]i
FN [ba]-tu-la-at [š]a PN "with FN, the adolescent daughter
of PN" 3:66a:10ff.; a-ma-at [la]-a ba-ni-ta "an improper
deed" 5:87:16f.; a-ma-at an-ni-ta₅ "this deed" ibid.:26;
a-ma-at maš-ik-ta "an evil deed" ibid.:30[219] The reason for
the use of the absolute state in these examples is not clear.

In normal Akk., the construction for measurements and
things measured is: number (absolute), measure (absolute),
thing measured (case from context);[220] an example would be:
2(šena) kakkar kaspa inandin "he will give 2 talents of sil-
ver!" In the U texts, however, the measure derives its case
from the context, and the thing measured is a nomen rectum
in the gen., dependent on it. Thus, we find: 2 ka₄-ka₄-
r[a][221] KÙ.BABBAR-pt i-na-an-din 3:52a:23f.; 1 ka₄-ka₄-ra
GUŠKIN...i-na-an-d[in] ù 5 ka₄-ka₄-ra KÙ.BA[BBAR]...i-na-
[an-din] 3:154:20ff.; 1 GUN KÙ.BABBAR-pt...i-din 3:54a:17ff.
In the first two examples, kakkara has a case-ending, even
though a bound form (see above). Note that nouns after nu-
merals are sg.;[222] cf. also 500 KÙ.BABBAR-pa 3:104:26,31,34,

---

[219]This text exhibits a number of peculiarities; cf.
the broken writing in the last example; see p. 100, n. 33.

[220]Cf. GAG §62d.

[221]Nougayrol (followed by CAD K, 50a) reads: qa-qa-
r[u(?)-m]a(?). The copy, however, has ⟨⟩ , which looks
more like the beginning and end of RA; cf. 3:126 (16.162),
also from the reign of Ammistramru, for typical RU (⟨⟩ ;
ll.2,8,15,19) and RA (⟨⟩ ; ll.5,12).

[222]The verbs they govern are also always sg.; see below,

37.

The only numbers ever written syllabically (one, hundred, thousand) are normally in the absolute state: e.g., *1-en(ištēn)* "one" 6:98c:1(Ec.); *2 me-at 2 li-im* "2200" 3:160: 16. But in one text, "hundred" may be declined: *i-na 2 me-te* KÙ.BABBAR *kàs-pu* "for 200 silver" 3:169:14; it is possible that this form is a dual (*meʾtē*[223]), in the gen. case (correctly). *kàs-pu* is incorrectly in the nom. (*kàs-pí* is expected), perhaps because it is a gloss. The word *tāpal(u)* "pair" occurs only in the absolute state: e.g., 6:48:11'(J); 5:195:p.(Ec.).

4. *The Verb*

a. The Markers of Person.

i. *imperative*

The majority of forms present no problems. With one exception (*te-er-ri* (fs) 5:148:r9'), all attestations are ms. Some examples:

> G: *i-din-mì* *3:19:21; *id-na-an-ni*[224] EA49:23; *šu-up-ra-a⌈m-mi/a⌉* *5:142:13.

---

p. 312. In Ugaritic, numerals above 2 are usually followed by pl. nouns; however, the sg. does occur; cf. *UT* §7.10, p. 44. In Akk., the pl. is usually used; cf. *GAG* §139h.

[223]If this were in fact a dual, it would probably not be Akk., since it is doubtful that the scribes would have · learned so rare a form; the dual was still used in Ugaritic, however, and *me-te* could represent the bound form, oblique, *ʾmiʾ(a)tê*; cf. *UT* §8.5, pp. 53f. In contrast to this example, note *1 me-at* ⌈ *EA*49:28.

[224]Acc. for dat. suffix; see above, 200f. These forms are Bab. (vs. Ass. *din*).

D: Bab. *gu-mi-ir* *5:142:17, but Ass. *qar-ri-[ib]-šu*
*3:5:28.

Š: Bab. *šu-bi-la* *3:5:12; *šu-ub-ši* 3:51:7.

The only problematic form is *dub-bu-ub* "speak" *6:3:37.
The form should be fs; thus, either *dubbī* (G) or *dubbibī* (D)
is expected. For other forms, see below under weak verbs
(section e).

ii. *durative, preterite, perfect*

The use of these tenses will be discussed below, section
10. Only the forms of the affixes will be considered here.
(Additional forms are cited in the following sections.)

The 1s forms are with one exception typically MB: e.g.,
a-ma-at (G dur.) "(if) I die" *6:3:11;[225] *il(êl)-
te-qè* (G perf.) "I have taken" *3:19:7; *lu-ú i-de₄*
(G preform. stative) "let me know" 5:88:36; *ú-za-ak-
ki-ša* (D pret.) "I freed her" 3:111:9.

The only problematic form is *la-a a-ši-ib* "I will not stay"
5:173:26. Possibly, this is a WS (*yaqtul*) jussive, i.e.,
*ʾaθib (the Akk. dur. would be *uššab*). However, since
(w)ašābu usually occurs in the stative in U[226] (and always
in K), it is more likely that the form is a 3ms stative, in-
correctly replacing the expected 1s *ašbāku*. No forms with

---

[225]Note also *la-lak* for *lā allak* "I will not go" 6:74:
4, as pointed out by A.F. Rainey in *IOS* 3, 41.

[226]E.g., 5:87:22,24; *5:137:7.

prefix *i-* for expected *a-* occur, as is sometimes the case

in certain Amarna letters.[227]

Typical 2ms forms are:

tâq-ta-b[i][228] (G perf.) "you have said" *5:141:9;

ta-aš-pu-ra (G pret.) "you sent" 3:4:10; *ta-ṣa-bat-mi*

(G dur.) "you seize" *EA*45:24; *tu-še-bá-[al]* (Š dur.)

ibid.:28.[229]

A 2fs verb occurs in **EA48:5: *ta-at-ta-ad-ni* (G perf.)

"you have given."

3ms verbs normally have prefix *i-(/e-)*[230] in the G, *u-*

in the D and Š (examples *p.*). However, there are one or two

possible exceptions in the D; see below, pp. 246f. No examples

of a *y-* prefix occur.[231]

The 3fs nearly always has a *t-* prefix; *ta-* occurs about

three times as often as *ti-*, but there is no apparent reason

for the choice of one over the other. It should be noted,

however, that both never occur in the same text. Some exam-

ples are:

227Cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 54f.

228Also, *tâq-te-bi*, e.g., *3:195; see above, pp. 181ff.

229In **EA47:22, there occurs *ti(te₉)-še-em-me*, with
Bab. vowel harmony.

230See the discussion of the prefix of verbs I-ʾ, above,
pp. 179ff.

231In **EA47:24, Knudtzon restores [...j]i-[š]a-al-li-iʾ,
but does not translate the form. Since it does not produce
a recognizable verb, and since the context is too broken to
make any sense, it is difficult to accept this as a unique
example of prefix *y-*.

G: dur. *ta-páṭ-ṭar* 3:60b:15; *ta-la-ka*[232] 3:107:11;

tu-ul-la-ad 5:5:r6'; *tù-šab* 3:56:25; pret.: *ta-din*[233] 6:124a:edge,b(Ec.); perf.: *ta-at-ta-din-šu*

3:50b:4; *ti-it-ta-din-šu-nu* 3:129:7; *ta-at-ta-ši*

3:50b:3; *ti-it-ta-aš-ši*[234] 3:129:4; *ta-al-te-qè*

3:64b:3; *ti-il-ta-q[è]* 5:173:2.

D: pret.: *tu-ma-al-li* 5:173:15.

Š: perf.: *t[u-u]š-te-rib* 3:55:19.

There are very few 3fs verbs that do not have the *t*-prefix: ⸢*ù*⸣-*ṣí*[235] 3:55:17, a text that has 3fs with *t*-five times in subsequent lines; *it-ta-din-šu* 3:50b:10, but *t*- in *ll*.3,4, cited above. Text 3:110a has two 3fs verbs, both without *t*-: *el(A)-ta-na-ah l*.7; *ša ir-šu-ú l*.13. Note that this text also has m. -*šu* as pronominal suffix for "her" (*ll*.7,8,11,12,14).[236]

Only one 1p verb is attested: [*n*]*a-al-ta-par-šu* (G perf.) "we have sent him" 3:294:11. Note that the prefix is *na*- as is the case most often in K,[237] vs. normal Akk. *ni*-.

The only 2 pl. verb that occurs is m., and ends in (WS?)

---

[232]The subject is inanimate: *eleppašu* "his ship."

[233]In 6:110a:2(Ec.), *ta-din* is probably the Ass. stative (3ms); see below, p. 362, n. 692.

[234]On the extra *š*, see above, pp. 175f.

[235]Compare *tu-uṣ-ṣí* 5:5:r9'.

[236]But the f. stative *za-kà-at* in *l*.6.

[237]See above, p. 53.

-*ū*, as opposed to native Akk. -*ā*: *ta-al-ta-qu-mī* (G perf.)

"you have taken" 3:170a:8'.[238]

The prefixes of the 3mp are, with two exceptions, the

same as those of the sg. (examples *p.*). Both exceptions

have a *t-* prefix. One occurs in one of the badly written

texts mentioned above, pp. 169f.: *te-ṣa-bi-tu₄*[239] (G dur.)

"(if) they seize" 6:50:16. The other is found in an econo-

mic text: *PN ša ta-ba-'* GN 6:74b:1f. Nougayrol takes the

verb as second person,[240] but this makes little sense in a

list. It is more likely a 3mp, used impersonally, i.e.,

taba''û:[241] "PN who is sought in GN." In both texts, 3mp

---

[238]This verb occurs in a relative clause, and the text
is quite damaged a few lines earlier, and so it is possible
that this is a 2ms subjunctive. But the mention of *ana
ahhīšu* "to his brothers" in *l.*6, and the almost complete
lack of the subjunctive in U (below, pp. 242f.), make the pl.
more likely.

[239]Note that the theme vowel is incorrect (Akk. *iṣab-
batū*). Other instances of incorrect theme vowels are cited
below, 243f. Since *yvqattal* probably did not exist in
Ugaritic (cf. most recently T.L. Fenton, *JSS* 15, 31ff.), the
Akk. *iparras* form would have been strange to Ugaritic scribes.
It is tempting to interpret *te-ṣa-bi-tu* as representing a
Ugaritic D *yṣaṭul*, i.e., *tṣaḅḅitū* (like Hebrew *yeqaṭṭelū*);
however, the other 3mp with *t-* prefix is presumably a D, and
it has *ta-* (cf. also n. 241, below).

[240]He translates: PN "que tu recherches." A.F. Rainey,
IOS 3, 40, noting the oddity of a 2ms form in a text of this
type, suggests that perhaps the form is Ugaritic *tabaᶜa* "he
has departed." This seems less likely, however.

[241]In Akk., *bu''û* is always a D. Most likely, *taba''û*
is to be so taken as well; but whether or not *ta-* therefore
represents the Ugaritic prefix in the D cannot be decided on
the basis of this example alone (cf. also n. 239 above). In
UT §9.35, p. 82, Gordon suggests that the Ugaritic D prefix
does have an *a*-vowel, on the basis of several *ls yqtl's* which
he takes to be D's, and which have prefix *a*. It is doubtful

verbs occur without *t*- preformatives: note *e-te-e-ru* (for

itu(r)rū) "(if?) they return" 6:50:16; PN_2 *u* PN_3 *ša i-qa-bu*

... "PN_2 and PN_3 who say..." 6:74b:3f. The forms with *t*-

presumably reflect forms in the scribes' native dialect,

i.e., Ugaritic, in which the 3mp often has a *t*- prefix.[242]

Two other verbs are, in some of their occurrences,

marked pl. only by the addition of the pl. allomorph of the

ventive to a sg. form:[243] *i-tū-ur-ni* "(if) they return" 5:

10:17,22; cf. 5:181:18; *Sy*18:252:18; *ip-šur-ni₇* "they re-

leased" 5:263a:6. There are no 3mp forms in these texts

which have the WS imperfect pl. ending -*ūna*, common in many

Canaanizing Amarna texts.[244]

There is no certain example of a 3fp verb. In 5:87, a

badly written text, there occur three possibilities: *il-la!-*

ka[245] "they came(!)" *l*.13; *ik-šu-da-ni* "they(?) (did not)

---

that *taba'ʾû* is related to Ugaritic *bğy*, which occurs in the
G, meaning "to reveal": *wank ibğyh* (=*wa-ʾanāku ʾibğayuhu*)
"and I will reveal it" *UT* ^{c}*nt*:III:26, p. 254.

[242]*UT* §9.15, p. 75. 3mp verbs with *t*- prefix are also
common in many Amarna texts from Syria-Palestine; cf. Böhl,
Sprache, 52; A. Herdner, *RES*, 1938, 76ff.

[243]See below, 237ff., on the ventive.

[244]Cf. the examples in Böhl, *Sprache*, 53. J. Aro, *AfO*
18, 144, takes the frequently inexplicable ventive on many
pl. verbs (see below, 240ff.) to be due to Ugaritic influence.
Although he does not say so explicitly, he presumably has in
mind WS *-*ūna*.

[245]Nougayrol has *il-tāk(?)-ka*, which he suggests (his
n. 2) is for *it(t)alka*; however, he also notes there that
perhaps *il-la(!)-ka* is to be read, and he refers to *il-la-ka-*
an-ni in *l*.29. This is the much more likely alternative;
the forms are probably dur. past tense: "have been coming."

reach me" *l*.24; *il-la-ka-an-ni* "they(?) came to me" *l*.29.

The subject is *eleppētu* (f. pl.) "ships," in the first exam-
ple certainly, in the other two probably. But since the
scribe vacillates most strangely between sg. and pl. verbs
throughout the text,[246] I prefer to take all of these exam-
ples as 3ms.[247] The first would be ventive; the other two
would have the suffix *-anni*.[248] For sg. verbs with pl. sub-
jects, see below, p. 313.

iii. *precative*

   There are no problematic forms;[249] some examples:

   G: 1s: Bab. *lu-ú-uš-ku-un*[250] *5:140:30; third person

   forms are both Bab. and Ass.; 3ms: *li-id-bu-ub*

   5:98:r7'; *li-din-an-ni* *EA*49:21; etc.; 3mp: *li/e-*

   ru-bu *5:142:29; etc.[251]

---

[246]This is discussed in more detail below, pp. 312f.

[247]Against this interpretation, however, might be
eleppašu ta-la-ka "(if) his ship comes" 3:107:11.

[248]The suffixes (or ventive) on these are discussed
above, p. 200, n. 124.

[249]In *6:3:16,17, Nougayrol suggests restoring two
prec.'s: [*li*](?)-*iq-te-bu-ú-šu* and [*li*(?)-]*it-t*[*a*]-*bal*, on
the basis of [*l*]*i-iš-ku-nu* in *l*.15. These forms are all
that can be read in their respective lines. But, since no
other prec.'s in U are based on the perf., and since there
is no context at all, it is almost certain that these forms
are simply perf.'s (*iqtebûšu*, *ittabal*), especially since
the prec.'s in *ll*.15,23 are correctly formed.

[250]The extra vowel sign is unusual.

[251]In 5:148:9, (*ilānu*) *li-iš-la-mu-ki*, like the clause
that follows it (see below, p. 260, n. 369), must be com-
pared with *Ug*. 5:131, a text of unknown origin, where we

D: 1s: the only example may be Bab. or Ass.: *lu-ga-*

mi-ir-mi[252] *5:142:15; all third person forms

but one are Bab.: 3ms: *li-haḷ-li-iq* 3:105:57;

etc., but Ass. *lu-ū-ma-[al-li]* 5:7:5',[253] 3mp:

li-te-ru-ni-in-ni *5:142:18; etc.

š: the following are all the attested forms: 3ms:

Bab. *li-še-r[i-ib-šu]* 5:98:r7', but Ass. *lu-še-*

ri-ib-š[u] ibid.:r4', and *[l]u-še-bi-la* ibid.:r11'.

No f. forms, either *liprus* or *lū taprus*,[254] occur.

---

have *(ilānu) li-s/šal-la-mu-ka* in *l*.3'. It is difficult to
determine which form is the "correct" one. Both have problems: the former should be from *salāmu* "to be friendly"
(in spite of the sibilant--read *t̬s*?--and the wrong vowel
class), since *šalāmu* G would make little sense. If the verb
is *salāmu*, the pronoun would then be dat.: "may (the gods)
be friendly to you." The latter, if it is a D, should have
i in the third syllable, and would be from *šullumu*, since
with *šullumu* men are the subject, gods the object, not vice
versa, as here (cf. *AHw*, 1014b), and since the suffix (*-ka*)
is acc., not dat. (*-ku*). I see no way to explain both forms
satisfactorily.

[252]Cf. P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 290. Nougayrol read *lu ga-
mi-ir-mi*, and translated: "Que c'(en) soit terminé." This
is possible, of course; note however that *lū* is always writ-
ten *lu-ū* in U (see below, p. 321). For *gummuru* in the sense
"to render a final verdict," clearly the meaning here, cf.
CAD G, 30 (*gamāru* 3 f).

[253]It is not likely that the form should be read *lu ū-
ma-[al-li]* with asseverative *lū*; even if the form ended with
-li (as is most probable; see below, pp. 245f.), and was
thus pret., it would be a pret. replacing a dur. (a common
phenomenon in U; see below, pp. 345ff.), since the meaning
must be future. But asseverative *lū* is never used with the
dur. (in native Akk., at least); cf *GAG* §81f. Moreover, *lū*
is elsewhere in U always written *lu-ū*.

[254]A. Ungnad and L. Matouš, *Grammatik des Akkadischen*
5th ed. (München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1969) §60a, p. 69; cf.
GAG, p. 10*, paradigm 10.

iv. *stative*[255]

Examples of 1s, 3mp, 3fs, and 3mp statives occur. Most are formed correctly, but there are a number of problems. In the G, note the following examples:

> 1s: *mar-ṣa-k[u]* *6:3:9; 3ms: *na-ker* 3:68:7; *a-ni-ih* 3:84:24; *šak-na-ak-k[u]* 5:98:13; probably also *ta-din* 6:110a:2(Ec.), the Ass. stative of *n/tadānu*[256]

> 3fs: *ha-aš-ha-at(-ma)* 3:53b:11,13; *na-da-at* 5:87:25;

> 3mp: *sà-ar-ru* 3:98:24; *aš-bu* 5:87:22,24; etc.

The verb *ṣamātu*[257] "to transfer," which is unique to U,̮ usually has as stative *ṣa-mi-it*, as in 3:126:17; etc.[258] However, it is occasionally *ṣa-ma-at*, as in 5:9:11.[259] The reason for this variation may be that the scribes believed that all Akk. statives had *i*-vowels, whereas, perhaps, the "perfect" of this verb in Ugaritic was *ṣamata*. Two forms support this suggestion: *ra-pí-iš* 5:8:8, which should be *rapaš*;[260] and *ṣa-ma-t[a]* 3:52a:16, which probably exhibits

---

[255]The presentation of the stative in this study is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

[256]See below, p. 362, n. 692.

[257]Discussed at length in *CAD* Ṣ, 93ff., especially 94b. See also O. Loretz, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 1962, 269ff.

[258]The other syllabically written occurrences are: 3:35a:8; 3:96:19,22; 3:99b:9; 3:121:10; 3:126:14; 3:127f.:10,25; 3:129:16; 3:130:8,10; 3:138f.:9,22,26; 3:142a:10; 3:143:8; 3:146:10; 3:160:17; 3:161b:12; 3:173c:4'; 5:8f.:14,23; 5:263:11, 6:29:20.

[259]Also 3:36a:9; 3:87:r9'; 3:113:7; 5:179:6; 6:62c:4. Note also the pl. *ṣa-ma-tù* 3:90b:13.

[260]Cf. *AHw*, 955a.

the Ugaritic perfect 3ms morpheme *-a rather than the Akk. ventive;[261] cf. also the unique D form of ṣamatu, also with -a: ṣú-um-mu-ta (as a gloss for ŠÀM.TIL.LA.ŠÈ[262]) 3:63b: 12. Thus, ṣamit would have been considered the correct form, and ṣamat a lapsus. A similar alternation in the theme vowel is found in the verb zakû; usually, the stative is za-ki, as in 3:68:16; etc.[263] But several times, a form with -a occurs: e.g., za-ka₄ 3:33a:6; za-ak-ka! 3:166:16'; za-ka₄-a 6:39:8; 6:52b:8.[264] Again, it is doubtful that the forms with -a are ventives; more likely, they represent WS *qatala's.

A difficult sentence is the following: i]na(?) libbi māti annīti [x x(?) Ì]R(?).MEŠ ša bēlīya lu-û ga-am-ru *6:3: 30f. It is likely that the subject (pl.) of gamrū was in the lacuna, and that the sentence means: "In this land, may the [...] of my lord's servants(?) be completed."[265]

_____

[261]Cf. yṣa(=*yaṣa'a "went out") UT I Aqht:75, p. 245, 2100:21, p. 26*. If this were so, it would also explain the lack of contraction in ṣa-ma-t[a] (cf. šak-na-ak-k[u] above), and in the pl. ṣa-ma-tû 3:90b:13 (cf. ga-am-ru below). See further, pp. 237ff. on the ventive.

[262]Correct CAD Ṣ, 94a; there is no BI in the copy.

[263]Also 3:46:11; 3:54a:12; 3:70:18,20; 3:78:14(bis); 3:82:12,19; 5:15:r3',10'; 6:48:16'; and note za-a-ki 3:162b:9, and za-ak-ki 3:110a:5.

[264]Perhaps also [za-k]à-à] (?) 3:102:21; za-ku in 5:182: 5' is probably a pl.

[265]Nougayrol translates: "[au] sein(?) de ce pays, tous (les gens) sont [des serviteu]rs de mon maître." This is impossible both semantically, since gamru as an adjective does not modify people (cf. CAD G, 37f.), and syntactically, since literally the sentence would have to mean: "In this land the servants of my lord are indeed all."

The form *ha-ta-ad-di* in 5:98:12 is also difficult; Nougayrol's transliteration (followed here) indicates that he considered it to be a Gtn stative, 3ms, of *hadû*. Although that should be *hitaddu*,[266] it remains the most likely proposal.[267]

All D statives are Bab.:

> *sú-um-mu-uh* 3:114:28 (but *šu-um-mu-uh*[268] 3:58a:8);
>
> *ṣu-um-mu-ta* 3:63b:12 (see above); 3mp: *sú-um-mu-hu* 3:137b:7'; 5:5:5'.

The form *ma-ad-da-du* in 5:8:9 is very puzzling; the sentence is: *PN u FN aššatšu ipšurūni 5 pu-ri-du₄ A.ŠÀ : GÍD.DA ù 3 pu-ri-du₄ A.ŠÀ ra-pt-iš ma-ad-da-du* "PN and his wife FN released a field 5 *p.* in length (lit.: it is long) by 3 *p.* in width (lit.: it is wide); they (i.e., length and width?) were surveyed(?)." Even if this interpretation is correct, the last word should be *maddū*[269] (G) or *muddudū* (D).

An N stative may occur in the following clause: *PN₁ u PN₂ mār PN₃ na-ap-ṭa-ru eqla ina eqli* "PN₁ and PN₂ son of PN₃ .?. field for field" 3:89a:4. The lines following this make it clear that the two individuals exchanged property.

---

[266] Cf. *AHw*, 307b (*hadû* Gtn); *GAG*, p. 41*, paradigm 32.

[267] I fail to understand P.-R. Berger's suggestion (*UF* 2, 287) to read "*ha-da-at-ti* = *hadâti*, 'assyrischer' Stativ," unless he means an Assyrianized (-*tt*-?), WS 1s form (-*ti*).

[268] See above, pp. 189f.

[269] Perhaps the -*da*- should be omitted: *ma-ad-‹da-›du*.

Both Nougayrol[270] and von Soden[271] take *na-ap-ṭa-ru* as a de-
verbal noun, the former as a "nom employé au statif," mean-
ing "délogeants," and the latter unsure of its meaning. But
perhaps the form is an N stative, 3mp with a reciprocal
nuance: "they released to each other."[272]

    No Š statives are attested.

b. The Ventive.

    The allomorphs of the ventive are: *-a(m)*, on sg. verb
forms;[273] *-ni(m)*, on pl. forms.[274] Mimation has been lost,
except when not final (see above, 186ff.). In four examples
of *târu* and one example of *pašâru*, the pl. is formed simply
by adding *-ni(?)* directly to the sg. verb: *šumma...PN u
mārūšu i-tù-ur-ni* "if...PN and his sons return" 5:9f.:15ff.;

---

    [270]See *PRU* 3, 219 (under "Echanges") and 223 (*paṭāru*);
Nougayrol translates the form as a verb ("délogent(?)"), how-
ever.

    [271]*AHw*, 742a.

    [272]Against this interpretation, it must be admitted, is
the clearly nominal form *na-ap-ṭa-ra* (*lā ubbal*) "(He will
not bear) any ..." in 3:80:15f. Whatever the meaning there,
however, it does not seem to be the same as in 3:89a:5. If
it is in fact an N verb, perhaps it represents a WS N *qatala*,
since the N stative is quite rare in Akk.

    [273]No 2fs or 1p forms occur with the ventive.

    [274]There is a slight possibility that two verbs in 5:87
(*ik-šu-da-ni* in *l*.24 and *il-la-ka-an-ni* in *l*.29) are 3fp,
with the 1s acc suffix. If so, the ventive plus 1s suffix,
which should be *-āninni*, (cf. *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* *5:142:8),
has been reduced to *-ā-nni*. However, it is more likely that
the forms are 3ms; see above, pp. 231f.

cf. ibid.:21f.; 5:181:8; *Syl*8:252:18 (but note, e.g., *šumma*

...*PN u mārūšu i-tu-r[u]-ni₇* 3:114:18f.); *PN₁*...*u PN₂ ahūšu*

u mārūšunu ip-šur-ni₇ "PN₁..., his brother PN₂, and their

sons released" 5:263a:3ff. (but note *PN u FN aššatšu ip-šu-*

ru-ni₇[275]). Why the pl. ventive allomorph was deemed suf-

ficient indication of the pl. in these few examples is not

clear.

One use of the ventive is to mark the 1s dat.: e.g.,

ta-aš-pu-ra "you sent to me" 3:4:10.[276] This function is

often usurped, however, by the attachment of the acc. suffix

(*-anni/-ūninni*), which also always includes the ventive mor-

pheme.[277] Perhaps we should also include as examples of the

ventive as 1s dat. the passages where a substantival dat.,

referring to the speaker, occurs as well: e.g., *il-tap-ra*

šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka "The king my lord has written

to me, (i.e.,) to your servant" *3:5:9f.[278] But these pas-

sages could just as readily be grouped under the closely re-

leated use of the ventive to indicate motion to a point op-

posite the speaker; thus, the last example could also be

translated "has sent here to your servant." Other, less am-

biguous examples of this second use of the ventive, also with

---

[275]Perhaps also *ip-šu-[ru(?)-ni₇(?)* 3:35b:4.

[276]Other examples are listed above, pp. 199f.

[277]The 1s acc. and dat. suffixes are discussed above,
pp. 196, 199ff.

[278]Cf. also 5:98:r11',14'.

verbs of motion and sending, imagine the speaker in the pre-
sence of the addressee: e.g., il-la-ku-⸢nim-ma⸣ ana muhhi
bēlīya [u] bēl(u)ya i-š[a]-i-la-šu-nu-ti "They will come
(here) to my lord, and my lord will question them (here) *6:
3:28f.; PN mār-šipri ana muhhīka al-tap-ra "PN the messenger
I have sent (here) to you" *6:12:15f.; ana muhhi šarri bēlīya
i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti "He will take (bring) them (here) to the
king my lord" *3:5:15f.[279] This same phenomenon explains
the normal use of the ventive before the 2ms. dat. suffix:
ul-te-bi-lak-ku "I have sent (here) to you" 5:98:r20'; šak-
na-ak-k[u] "is established(?) (here) for you" ibid.:13.[280]

The observations made above cover all the occurrences
of the ventive found in the letters. But with the exception
of eleppašu ta-la-ka "(if) his ship comes here" 3:107:11, and
possibly [a]t-ta-ad-na-šu "I have given to him (here?)" 3:
83:29, they do not adequately explain any of the ventives
in the legal documents. It was suggested above (pp. 234f.),
that the apparent ventive on sg. stative verbs might reflect
the WS *qatala conjugation: e.g., ṣa-ma-t[a] 3:52a:16; ṣú-
um-mu-ta 3:63b:12; za-ka₄ 3:33a:6. Since these forms are
all paralleled in similar contexts by forms without final
-a, it is difficult to consider them ventives.

Only two sg. prefix conjugation verbs with final -a

---

[279]On the difficult form il-la!?-ka 5:87:13, see n.
245, p. 231.

[280]Note that in li-iš-la-mu-ki 5:148:9, the (probably)
dat. 2fs pronoun is not attached to the ventive. On this
form, see above, n. 251, pp. 232f.

occur in the legal texts; and both are paralleled by verbs

without -a in similar contexts: compare u il-tăk-na-aš-šu

ina maryannî "He (the king) placed him among the maryannu"

3:140:5f., and u il-ta-kăn^{an}-šu ina mŭde šarri "He (the

king) placed him among the royal councillors" 3:134:11f.

The other example is [i-tu]-ur-ra^{281} "(if PN) returns" 5:

180:13; but note i-tu-ur "(if PN$_2$) returns" in ibid.:8.

Similar parallels can be found with several pl. verbs; note:

1 bilta kaspi ŭ-ma-lu-ni$_?$ "they will pay 1 talent of silver"

Sy18:252:19,^{282} but 1 bilta kaspi ŭ-ma-lu-ŭ ibid.:23; pilka

...up-pă-lu-⌈ni$_?$⌉ "they will be responsible for the feudal

service..." 3:120:10ff., but pilka...[u]p-pă-lu 3:145:34f.;

PN u FN aššatšu il-te-qu-ni X eqla "PN and his wife FN have

taken X field" 5:9:3f., but FN$_1$ u PN$_1$ u FN$_2$ mărŭsa il-te-qu-ŭ

eqla ša PN$_2$ "FN$_1$ and her children PN$_1$ and FN$_2$ have taken the

field of PN$_2$" 3:159b:4ff.^{283}

   In other instances, verbs which occur frequently in the

sg., always without the ventive ending, have it the one or

two times they are pl.: e.g., it-ta-ši "he has taken (up)"

3:48a:4, and p., but it-ta-šu-ni 3:61:6;^{284} ip-šur "he re-

---

   ^{281}Unless]ur-ra [šēra] is to be read; see below, p.
348, n. 642.

   ^{282}Cf. also ŭ-ma-al-lu-ni$_?$ in 3:37a:8 (and l.16, where
it is sg.; see below, pp. 311f., on agreement).

   ^{283}Note also u za-ku-ni$_?$ ištu muhhi PN "they are free
(of claims) from PN" 3:54a:9f., and za-ku mă[rŭ GN(?)] ištu
muhhi [5:182:5'f. Also, in a letter, lu-ŭ za-ku-ŭ *5:142:30.

   ^{284}This is the only pl. example of this verb.

leased" 5:179:4; 5:263b:4; 5:264:4; etc., but $ip-šu-ru-ni_7$

5:8:5; $ip-šur-ni_7$[285] 5:263a:5. Note also that the frequent

sg. forms of $mullû,$[286] $(w)abalu,$[287] and $leqû,$[288] pl. forms

of which were given above, are always non-ventive.[289] Cor-

responding to pl. $i-tù-ur-ni$[285] 5:10:17,22, is sg. $i-tù-ur,$

ibid.:26.[290] The other verbs with the ventive suffix do

not occur elsewhere in U: $it-ta-za-mu-ni_7$[291] "they (must

not) complain" 3:66a:8; $⌈i⌉(?)-za-i-zu-ni_7$[291] "they divided"

ibid.:14; la $i-šu-ni_7$ "they do not have" (glossing NU.TUK)

3:102:15.[292]

In none of these examples from the legal texts is the

notion of "motion toward (a point opposite) the speaker"

appropriate for the occurrence of the ventive. In fact, the

occurrence, in so many cases, of parallel passages without

ventives, seems to render it meaningless in those texts

where it does appear. It is possible that some scribes felt

---

[285]On the absence of $-ū$, see above, pp. 237f.

[286]E.g., 5:176b:7; 5:180:10,16.

[287]E.g., 3:126:25; 3:155a:13; 6:29:30; 6:32a:12; and
often.

[288]E.g., 3:130a:3, and $p.$

[289]With the exception of the above-mentioned $i-le-qa-$
$aš-šu-nu-ti$ in a letter, *3:5:16.

[290]However, $[i-tu]-ur-ra$ does occur once; see above.

[291]On these forms, see below, pp. 246f.

[292]Note, later in the text: la $i-šu[$ ($l.19$), with pl.
subject.

-*ūni* to be the mark of the pl., especially in texts where
all pl. verbs are so marked, such as 5:9f. and 3:66a. But
this is only sometimes the case, while other texts, such as
3:61f. and 3:113f., have both ventive and non-ventive pl.
verbs. Nor does it seem likely that the ventive allomorphs
correspond to WS morphs, for the sg. verbs in question are
not volitive (i.e., WS *-a*), and most of the pl. verbs are
not "imperfects" (i.e., -*ni* for WS *-na* on plurals[293]).
Perhaps, in the case of the pl. verbs at least, the scribes
considered -*ū* and -*ūni* simply to be variant markers of plu-
rality. Otherwise, I can find no explanation for these pe-
culiar examples of the ventive. Nor is there any obvious
reason for the disparity between the letters and the legal
texts in the use of the ventive.[294]

c. The Subjunctive.

There is only one certain subjunctive form in the en-
tire U corpus:[295] *mīnum-mê maršītšu...ša ir-šu-û* "whatever

_____

[293]Vs. J. Aro, *AfO* 18, 144.

[294]Cf. also, in an economic text: *ir-te-ha* 6:104f.:*p*.
Here too the ventive seems to serve no purpose. Could it be
the 3ms marker of the WS perfect (*qatala*)? Cf. A.F. Rainey,
UF 5, 235ff., especially 255ff.

[295]In 3:170b:8', *ša-a ta-al-ta-qu-mī*, the verb is pro-
bably 2mp, with (WS?) -*ū* rather than normal Akk. -*ā* (see
above, pp. 229f., and n. 238); in ibid.:13', *ša-a û-ze-ku-û*,
the verb is probably 3mp. For 5:81:15, P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2,
286) proposes ⌈a⌉p₁-⌊qî⌋-*du-šu* "(das) ich ihm anvertraute."
However, the reading is too uncertain to be included. (I
fail to find any trace of the *AB* in the copy.) In *6:3:27,
the verb should likely be sg.: *šumma* ⌈mann⌉*um-ma(?) û-šâm-*
ra-gû-šu-nu-ti "if anyone(?) causes them trouble." Since pl.
verbs with sg. subjects are very rare in U (see below, 313),

property of hers(!)...which she acquired" 3:110a:11ff. For

verbs in other subordinate (including relative) clauses, see

below, pp. 332ff.

d. The Derived Conjugations.

It should be noted at this point that a few G verbs

exhibit the wrong thematic vowel: *i-ra-ṣa-ap* "he will re-

pair" 3:112b:9, usually *i*-class (cf. *ti-ir-ta-ṣí-ip* 3:137:

9);[296] *ir-ta-ku-us* "he has bound" 3:55:5 (*a/u*-class), per-

haps influenced by *ir-ku-us̆-s̆u* in the next line; *ti-ir-hu-uṣ*

: *ti-tar-h[u-uṣ]*[297] "she will run out(?) 5:6:10', in this

meaning usually *i*-class.[298] Some verbs occur with different

vowels in different texts; note: *i-qar-ru-ub* "may not ap-

proach" 5:15:13', and *i-qar-ru-bu* 5:5:5', but *i-qar-ri-ib*

---

perhaps the verb here is subjunctive after *s̆umma* (cf. a simi-
lar situation in K, above, pp. 62f.); however, no subjunc-
tive appears after *s̆a* in the previous clause: *mannum-mê s̆a*
...*e-ep-pa-as̆* "whoever exercises..." *ll*.25f.

[296]*AHw*, 959b; another example probably occurs in a
text from Boghazkoy (*KUB* 3:67:5), cited ibid. (*raṣāpu* G l).

[297]Nougayrol's explanation (his n. 2) of this peculiar
form as a Gt dur. with metathesis (*tirtahhuṣ→titarhuṣ*) is
not convincing. However, no other solution presents itself,
except possibly to read *ti̧ti̧r-h[u-uṣ]*; but it seems unlikely
that one form would be glossed by the same form with a dif-
ferent spelling.

[298]Cf. *AHw*, 942f. (*rahāṣu* I G A; this reference under
3 b "laufen"). Nougayrol (his n. 2) takes the verb from
rahāṣu II "to trust in, rely on," but the notion of movement
makes more sense; cf. the parallels with *paṭāru Sy*18:249:23;
*Sy*28:174:12; 3:60b:15; *aṣû* 5:177:10. As Nougayrol also
notes, a dur. is expected here; see below, pp. 345ff. Ano-
ther instance of the wrong vowel may be *li-is̆-la-mu-ki*, if
from *salāmu* (*i*); see above, n. 251, pp. 232f.

3:86:10; *Sy*18:254:seal, *l.*2;[299] *i-ma-gàr* [300] "he would (not)

agree" 6:52b:6, but *ta-ma-an-g*[*ur*] 3:60b:12.[301] Finally,

the form *i-ša-aṭ-ṭù-ru* "they were writing" 3:97:19, shows

Ass. vowel harmony (Bab. *išaṭṭarū*).

The peculiar doubling of the middle radical in the G

perf. of *našû* was noted above, 175f. For D verbs with a G

prefix, see the remarks on the D, below.

A possible example of a Gt is *it-te-ṣi* 5:177:10. The

form must be translated as a future: "he will go out." It

will be shown below (pp. 345ff.) that there are numerous in-

stances in U in which the pret. replaces the dur., but only

one where the perf. replaces the dur. Thus, *it-te-ṣi* is

probably not a G perf., but rather a Gt, either dur. (*itteṣṣi*)

or pret. (*itteṣi*).[302]

It was noted above (p. 236) that a probable Gtn form is

---

[299]According to *AHw*, 915f., this verb is usually *i*-class,
but occurs with *u* in OA, and occasionally in late dialects.
The *a* in the second syllable is Ass., vs. Bab. *iqerrib*.

[300]This remains a more likely reading than A.F. Rainey's
proposed *i-*⌈*ba*⌉*l-qar* (*IOS* 3, 39).

[301]Nougayrol reads *ta-ma-an-*[*ni*], but notes (n. 1) that
the scribe may have written *ta-ma-an-g*[*ur*] for *i-ma-an-gur*.
In the text to that point, the king has given FN to PN *ana
kallūtīšu* "in marriage to him," forever. Then we have:
šumma urram šeram FN lā ta-ma-an- ⬛ *ana kallūti ša PN.* I
see no reason to shy away from rendering "if in future FN
does not agree to marriage with PN." *CAD* K, 85b (*kallūtu* 1 d)
so takes it as well.

[302]For the Gt of *(w)aṣû*, with separative force, see *CAD*
A/2, 369f. If the *e*-vowel is related to the phenomenon in
forms such as *iq-te-bi*, described above, 181ff., then it is
likely the form is a pret., which is formally identical with
the G perf.

ha-tá-ad-dí (for expected *hitaddu*), a 3ms stative, meaning

"(your servant) rejoiced continuously" 5:98:12. The form

it-ta-za-mu-ni₇ "they (may not) complain" 3:66a:8, could be

a Gtn pret.; the *a*-class is attested elsewhere for the Gtn

of *nazāmu*.[303] Nevertheless, von Soden lists the form as a

Dt dur.,[304] presumably because the verb is a prohibition,

and so a dur. is expected. This gains some support from the

shape of the verb in *l*.14, which is a D, and yet probably

has *i*- as its prefix: ⌜*i*⌝ (?)-*za-i-zu-ni₇*[305] "they divided."

However, a dur. in not absolutely necessary in *l*.8, since the

pret. is used in prohibitions elsewhere in U.[306] Thus, the

matter must remain unresolved.

The D in these texts poses some interesting problems.

First, the only formally unambiguous dur.'s[307] are *ú-ba-q[ar]*

"(may not) appeal" 6:34b:4, and *ú-nam-mar-šu-nu*[308] 3:82:18.

Otherwise, the pret. occurs where the dur. is expected, at least 11 times.[309] The examples are discussed below in the section on the use of the tenses (pp. 345ff.). For now, it is interesting to speculate that perhaps these pret. forms represent underlying WS imperfective forms (i.e., *yvqat-til-).[310]

Secondly, the perf. occurs only once:[311] *uk-tab-bi-it* 3:109a:12. This is peculiar in that, in the G and Š conjugations, the perf. is at least as common as the pret., if not more common.

In 3:34b:5', *i-ma-lu-ú* for "they will pay" incorrectly has the G rather than the D prefix. The rest (i.e., the base) of the form could be either G or D. The form ⌐i⌐ (?)-za-

---

deliver their shares to the palace, and ... his sons." Nougayrol translates the form in question "il les (y) a fait comparaître"; *CAD* E, 262a, has "and (thus) gained exemption for his sons." Neither of these renderings has any support. (*AHw*, 769f., does not list the form under *nawāru* D.) Note that, against these two translations, there is no reason not to translate the verbs in the two clauses as future, or, more likely, as expressing obligation (i.e., "is to deliver ..., etc.").

[309]*ú-qa-al-li-il Sy*18:249f.:19; *ú-kab-bi-i*[t] ibid.: 25; *ú/tu-ma-al-li* ibid.:19; 5:173:15; 5:176:7; 5:180:10,16; *ú-ma-'-er* 3:83:32; *ú-na-ke-er* 3:105:56; *ú-na-mi-iš* 3:154: 17f.; *ú-ra-bi* 3:76a:10; perhaps also *ú-ra-eṭ-ip-šu-nu* 3: 125:12.

[310]The vocalization of the Ugaritic D prefix-conjugation is of course presumed to be *yvqattil-*, on the basis of all other WS languages. These pret. forms, if they do reflect Ugaritic forms, provide some evidence for this presumption, at least, in terms of the theme vowel. It is unlikely, however, that we can go further, and conclude that the prefix was *yu-*; see also above, nn. 239, 241, p. 230.

[311]In *3:19:19, *ut-te-er-mi* should be emended to *li!-te-er-mi*, since an injunctive form is required: "let him return (my servants to me)."

i-zu-ni₇[312] "they divided" 3:66:14, also probably has a G

prefix, but here the base is D (pret.). (Note that D *zuʾʾuzu*

generally replaces G *zâzu* in MB,[313] although the latter does

occur once in U: *i-zu-zu-û* 5:173:23.) In the same text,

*l.*8, *it-ta-za-mu-ni₇* is perhaps a Dt with an *i*-prefix; but

see above, under Gtn.

Finally, there are three D verbs in U that do not oc-

cur in the D anywhere else in Akk.: *li-ra-ḫi-iṣ-šu* "may he

inundate him" 3:76a:9,13;[314] *ú-ra-ṣí-ip-šu-nu* "he will! re-

pair them" 3:125:12;[315] *ú-te-bu-û* "they (may not) raise (a

lawsuit)" 3:70:24.[316] Note also [*ú*]-*ša-ri-ip* "he burned" 5:

87:15; *šarāpu* occurs in the D only rarely.[317] I can find

no reason for the occurrence of these verbs in the D.

The form *ta-ba-ʾ* 6:74b:1 is probably a WS D (3mp; see

---

[312]Nougayrol transliterates *ú(?)-za-i-zu-nim*, but in the
copy the first sign, though quite damaged, looks more like
I: 𒁹 .

[313]*CAD* Z, 84a.

[314]Cf. *AHw*, 943a. For the G, cf. *ti-ir-ḫu-uṣ* 5:6:10'.

[315]Cf. *AHw*, 960a. For the G, cf. *i-ra-ṣa-ap* 3:112b:9;
ti-ir-ta-ṣí-ip 3:137a:9.

[316]Cf. *AHw*, 1343a. The G does not occur in U; it is
found, however in a Khatti text from Ras Shamra: *PRU* 4:98:29'.

[317]Cf. *AHw*, 1185a. Another possible example is *ú-qa-bi*
"(s)he said(?)" 3:157a:19'; *AHw*, 890a, lists only two other D's
of *qabû*. It is equally possible, however, since the text is
badly damaged, that *ú-ka₄-bi-*[*it*] "she honored" was intended;
cf. *Syl*18:250:25; 3:109a:12. There is also *ṣú-um-mu-ta* "it is
transferred" 3:63b:12, instead of the normal G. This verb
occurs only in U; see above, 234f. Finally, while the D of
namāšu is fairly common (cf. *AHw*, 726b), no difference exists
between *ú-na-mi-iš* 3:154:18, and *i-na-mu-uš* 3:81:26 (both
mean "(may not) advance (a lawsuit)"). For *ú(?)-tab-bi-*[*it*]
5:81:33, see below, p. 256, n. 347.

above, p. 230).

With the possible exception of it-ta-za-mu-ni_7 (see above, under Gtn and D), no Dt verbs are attested in U. No Dtn's occur.

In contrast to the D, there are few problems in the Š. Note the following examples:

> dur.: $\acute{u}$-$\check{s}\acute{a}m$-ra-$ṣ\acute{u}$-$\check{s}u$-nu-ti "(if someone?) causes them trouble" *6:3:27; pret.: $\acute{u}$-$\check{s}e$-ri-ib "he took in" 5:173:6,11; perf.: $u\check{s}$-te-rib "he took in" 3:64: 10, but ul-te-bi-lak-ku "I have sent to you" 5:98: r20';[318] imper.: $\check{s}ub$-$\check{s}i$ "present" 3:51:7. For the prec., see above, p. 233.

One Š pret. form occurs where a dur. is expected, as happens frequently in the D: $\check{s}a$ $u\check{s}$-bal-ki-it "whoever removes(?) (this gift)" 3:84:25.

No Št or Štn forms are found.

The only certain N's are dur.'s of the I-ʾ verbs $am\bar{a}ru$ and $n\bar{a}butu$; the latter always occurs in the N in Akk.[319] The forms are:

> 3ms: in-nam-mar "he met (with me)" *AnOr48:23:7; i-na-bi-it (i.e., $innabbit$) "(if) he flees" 3:37a: 7,14; ⌈in⌉(?)-na-bi-it 6:63c:9; 3mp: i-na-bi-tu_4 (i.e., $innabbittū$) "(if) they flee" 3:37b:9; cf. the participle mu-un-na<-ab>-$t\grave{u}$-ti 6:74a:2(Ec.).

---

[318]For $\check{s} \rightarrow l$, see the phonology section, above, pp. 188f.

The possibility that *na-ap-ṭa-ru* in 3:89a:5 is an N stative
was discussed above, pp. 236f. In *6:12a:11ff., the text
reads: *šanīta* ANŠE *ša il-te-qè ištu akanna* "moreover, as to
the ass which he took from here." Since no one has been
mentioned to whom "he" might refer, and since the 3mp, not
3ms, is used for impersonal subjects (see below, p. 318.),
Nougayrol's suggestion, to emend to an N pret., *il-leʾ-qè*,
should be accepted.

e. Weak Verbs.

Most of the weak verbs that occur are typical MB for-
mations. Thus, only a few examples of each type will be
listed, and comment will be reserved for peculiar forms.

i. *verbs I-'*$_{1-2}$

Examples of G forms are:

> dur.: *i-kal-šu* 3:92:14; pret.: *i-hu-uz-ša Sy*18:253:
> 14; cf. 3:76a:8; perf.: *e-ta-na-ah* 3:198:16; stative:
> *a-ni-ih* 3:84:24; 3:141:29.

All attested forms of the irregular verb *alāku* are G;

e.g.:

> dur.: *i-la-ak* 3:105:54; *il-la-ka-an-ni*[320] 5:87:29;
> *ta-la-ka* (3fs) 3:107:11; *la-lak* (for *lā allak*, 1s[321])
> 6:74:4; cf. the participle *la-li-ku* (for *lā ālikū*)

---

[320]On this form, and *il-⌈ták⌉ (?)-ka*, probably to be read
il-lal-ka, in *l*.13, see above, pp. 231f.

[321]Cf. A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 41.

ibid.:9; prec. *lil-ˈliˈ-ku-ni* (3mp) *5:142:28.[322]

On the prefix, in the G, of verbs I-ʾ in general, see the discussion above, pp. 179ff.

The only D forms encountered are the numerous examples of the dur. of *uppulu* (i.e., *uppal(ū)*). This verb has as object either an amount of silver (*kaspu*), or feudal service (*pilku, ilku,* or *unuššu*).[323] Thus, it seems to mean "to pay" or "to bear responsibility for." Because it is written with the *PA* sign (*ū-pa-lu* 3:61:15; *up-pa-lu* 3:53b:21) only when the object is *unuššu*, Nougayrol concluded that only with that object was the verb *uppulu*.[324] In all other cases, he transliterated the forms as from *(w)abālu*. He did concede, however, that all of the examples might be of a single verb, but that that would be *(w)abālu*.[325] It does seem more likely that we are dealing in all cases with only one verb; the fact that the only writings with *PA* occur with *unuššu* is almost certainly fortuitous. But several points argue that the verb in question is *uppulu* rather than *(w)abālu*. First, *(w)abālu* with *kaspu* as object means "to be worth, fetch a price,"[326]

---

[322]Perhaps also perf. *it-tal-[ku(?)]* *5:140:18.

[323]In 3:80:15f., the object is *naptaru*, the meaning of which is not clear. Nougayrol translates "liberation" (cf. also *PRU* 3, 223, sub *paṭāru*); *AHw*, 742a, refers to the OB meaning "Verwahrung" for this passage.

[324]*PRU* 3, 227. Nougayrol is followed by *CAD* A/2, 165a (*apālu* 6 b) with the object *unuššu*; but the dictionary does not list any of the other references, when the object is *(p)ilku* or *kaspu*, under either *abālu* or *apālu*.

[325]*PRU* 3, 227.   [326]*CAD* A/1, 20b (*abālu* A 5 b 1').

whereas *apālu*, frequently in the G, and rarely in the D,
means "to pay (a debt)";[327] the latter is clearly intended
in these texts. Secondly, *(w)abālu* does not ever connote
"responsibility" or "legal obligation," which is what is
meant in such phrases as *pilka ša bīti ū-BAL* "he will bear
the responsibility for the feudal service of the estate" in
3:67b:11. Again, *apālu*, usually in the G, can mean this.[328]
The fact that these notions are usually expressed by *apālu*
in the G, whereas in U the verb would be D, is scarcely a
problem, since we have seen (above, p. 247) other instances
of the D supplanting the G in U. The final piece of evidence
is that the G does occur once, in a context similar to those
in the D: *PN kasap hubullī ša bīti i-pu-ul* "PN will[329] pay
the silver of the debts of the estate" 3:60b:16f. Thus, in
spite of the fact that there are only two examples with *PA*,[330]
but four with *BA*[331] (most have *b/pal*[332]), the form is pro-
bably *uppal(ū)*.[333]

---

[327]*CAD* A/2, 156ff. (*apālu* A 1 a, 6 a).

[328]*CAD* A/2, 159ff. (*apālu* A 1 c-f).

[329]On the tense, see below, p. 347.

[330]3:53b:21; 3:61:15.

[331]3:120:12'; 3:129:19; 3:145:36; 3:166:r15'.

[332]3:63a:17; 3:67b:11; 3:77:10; 3:78:16; 3:80:16,19; 3:
82:21; 3:84:21; 3:85:16; 3:89:17,19; 3:96:17; 3:114:31; 3:
126:25; 3:135a:14; 3:146:14; 3:155a:13; 3:162b:7; 6:29:30;
6:32:11,14; 6:33:24.

[333]*BA* for *pâ* is not very common elsewhere in U, but it
is found; note, e.g., *aš-ta-pâ-ak* "I have poured" 3:110b:7.

N forms of *amāru* and *nābutu* were cited above, p. 248. No Š forms are attested.

ii. *verbs I-'*$_{3-5}$

All fientic forms of the G are third person; some examples:

> dur.: *ik-ki-im-šu* 3:62:18; *e-ru-ub-ma* 3:141:21,24; *i-ru-ub* 3:105:53,55; *e-ep-pa-aš* *6:3:26;[334] pret.: *i-pu-uš* 3:45:6; *e-ru-ub* 3:139:17,20;[335] perf.: *i-te-ru-ub* *3:19:11; *i-te-ep-šu* 3:97:15,17;[336]
>
> prec.: *li-ru-bu* *5:142:29; note also the infin. forms *e-pé-ši* 5:8:19; *e-pa-še* 6:110a:2(Ec.).

The prefix of third person forms is discussed in detail above, pp. 179ff. Since *i* and *e* are probably not distinguished, only the forms *e-ep-pa-aš* and *e-pa-še* are necessarily Ass.; *i-te-ep-šu* and *i-te-ru-ub* can only be Bab. For *edû*, see below under verbs I-*y* (section v).

In the Š, only *šurubu* "to cause to enter, deliver" is found:

> dur.: Bab. *ú-še-re-eb* 3:82:17, *ú-še-re-bu* 3:84:23, but Ass. *ú-še-ra-ab* 3:107:18; pret.: *ú-še-ri-ib* 5:173:6,11; perf.: *uš-te-rib* 3:64b:10, *t[u-uš]-te-rib*

---

[334]In 5:183:11', read *i-ba-áš*<-*ši*> "belongs (lit.: is)," vs. Nougayrol's *i-pá-áš*.

[335]Perhaps also *la i-ši-ib* 3:76a:9 (pret. or dur. of *ešēbu*); see above, p. 179, n. 46.

[336]Note also the broken writing *it-ep-šu-na-a-ši* 5:88:31.

(3fs) 3:55:19; prec.: Bab. *li-še-r[i-ib-šu]* 5:98:

r7', but Ass. *lu-še-ri-ib-š[u]* ibid.:r4'.

No D or N forms occur.

iii. *verbs II-'*[337]

The following are all of the attested forms:

G: dur.: *i-zê-'-er* 3:55:7; *[i]-zê-'-er-ša* ibid.:18;

probably also *i-zê-er*[338] ibid.:12; *i-ze-er*[338] 3:

75a:8,12; *Sy*28:174:13; pret.: *iš-a-am* 5:8:18;

perf.: *il-te-e* 3:72a:7; prec.: *li-iš-al-šu* 3:84:

28; *li-iš-a-lu-šu-nu-ti* (3mp) *6:3:23; infin.:

ša-a-li 4:294:9.

D: pret.: *û-ma-'-er* 3:80:32; *tu-ma-er* (3fs) 3:172b:

5'.

For *ta-ba-'* 6:74b:2, probably a WS D (3mp: *taba''û*),

see above, p. 230.

In two of the examples of *ze'ēru/zêru*, the '-sign (*AS*³,

no. 233) is used to indicate the doubled middle -''- of the

dur., i.e., *ize''er(ša)*. But in the other three, the '-sign

does not appear; if they are dur., it is impossible to de-

termine whether they should be normalized the same as the

above forms, or *izêr*, as in OB. The same ambiguity exists

with *il-te-e* (i.e., *iltê* or *ilte'e*) and *ša-a-li* (i.e., *šâli*

or *ša'āli*). After a consonant, ' is represented by a broken

---

[337]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 74ff.

[338]This form could also be pret.; but see below, p. 349,
and n. 645.

writing and extra vowel-sign in *iš-a-am* (i.e., *iš'am*).[339]

Between the different vowels in the D examples, one has the '-sign, while the other lacks it (for *(t)uma''er*).

A problematic form is *i-⌈ša-i-la⌉-šu-nu-ti* (if the reading is correct) for *iša''ilaššunūti* *6:3:29, presumably a dur. of *ša'ālu*, 3ms. The form is peculiar in that *ša'ālu* is normally an *a*-class verb, and yet it is *i*-class here. The only similar example is from Byblos in the Amarna corpus: *ti-ša-i-lu* EA89:40.[340] Perhaps these forms reflect a WS form with an *i*-vowel (e.g., **ša'ila*[341]). It is also possible that the two forms are in fact D pret.'s with incorrect prefixes.[342]

---

[339] In **EA47:13, simply by a broken writing: *iš-al-šu* for *iš'alšu*. Note that in native MB *ša'āmu* and *ša'ālu* are more likely treated as weak verbs (e.g., pret. *ta-ša-al*, i.e., *tašāl*) than written with ' or in broken form, contrary to the U examples; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 76f.; idem, *Glossar*, 98 (vs. *GAG* §§24c, 98g).

[340] Probably also, in the same text, *yi-ša-i-lu* ll.34, 45; but the vowel of the first sign is ambiguous. The final *-u* is the WS imperfective morpheme; cf. Moran, "Byblos," 72. *AHw*, 1151b, lists only two other G-type forms with *i*, both of them Gtn imper.'s: *ši-ta-'-il-šu-nu* AT 116:17 (Alalakh, MB level); *ši-ta-i-li-in-ni* ABAW NF 16:16:69 (Boğazköy).

[341] Cf. Ugaritic *šil* "he asked" *UT* 18:9,10,12. Note also Hebrew *šə'iltîw* I Samuel 1:20; *šə'ēlūnū* Psalm 137:3.

[342] The D *šu''ulu* is only attested in OA; cf. *AHw*, 1152a. On the use of the pret. where the dur. is expected (for *iša''ilaššunuti* is future), see below, pp. 345ff.; the Byblos example is made imperfective by the *-u* (see n. 340, above). Possible *i* prefixes for other D verbs in U are cited above, pp. 246f.; at Byblos, note also *ti-ba-ú-na* "they seek" (*bu''û*) EA129:29 (cf. 19); *i-wa-ši-ir* "I(!) sent" (*wuššuru*) EA137:8; cf. A.F. Rainey, *UF* 7, 419.

iv. *verbs I-w*

Examples of the G are:

dur.: 3ms: *û-šab* 6:74b:5,6; 6:75f.:*p.* (both Ec.);

uṣ-ṣẹt 3:114:26; 3fs: *tù-šab* 3:56:23; *tu-ul-la-ad*

5:5:6'; *tu-uṣ-ṣẹt* ibid.:9'; perf.: 3ms: *it-t[a]-bal*

*6:3:17.[343]

In the stative, one example preserves the initial *w*:[344]

[w]a-ši-ib *5:137:7; others do not, however: *aš-bu* 5:87:22,

24. In 5:173:26, *a-ši-ib*, formally a 3ms stative, is pro-

bably a mistake for 1s *ašbâku* (see above, p. 227).

Two peculiar G forms occur in the economic texts:

i-ṣa-ʾ "went out" 6:90a:4; *i-bi-la* "brought" 6:104:3,5,7; 6:

112b:2. It is unlikely that the scribe(s) simply wrote *i-*

for expected *û-*, since the first form would still be incor-

rect (Akk. *ûṣi*). Perhaps the initial *I*-sign should be read

ya_x, and the forms interpreted as WS (Ugaritic) "perfects":

yaṣaʾa, *yabila*.[345]

Of the three D forms attested, one preserves the ori-

ginal *w*: pret.: *û-wa-aš-šer₉* "he released" 3:110b:4; in the

_____

[343]Nougayrol proposes to make this form a prec. by re-
storing [li-]. This is very unlikely, however; see above,
p. 232, n. 249.

[344]Such forms are never found in native MB; cf. Aro,
SMbG, 32

[345]Cf. Ugaritic *yṣa* (*UT* 90:1, p. 184), *ybl* (*UT* 2101:12,
p. 26*). Another possibility, still suggesting that these
are WS perfects, is that in the spoken language, initial *ya-*
in open syllables had become (*yǝ-→) *ī-, as happened much
later in Aramaic (Syriac and Talmudic; e.g., *īteb* "he sat").
See also A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 45f., 47.

two other forms, *m* is written;[346] both are pret.: *û-ma-'-er*
3:81:32; *tu-ma-er* (3fs) 3:172b:5'.[347]

All *š* prefix-conjugation forms are of the *e*-type, as
in K.[348] Two dur. forms are Ass.: *û-še-baɫ* 5:98:10; *tu-še-
bâ-[aɫ]* EA45:28 (vs. Bab. *(t)ušebbe/iɫ*[349]). In 3:125:13',
û-še-ši-ib-šu-nu may be dur. or pret.; in the context, the
former is more likely.[350] The perf. forms attested could
be Bab. or Ass.: *uš-te-ɛṭ* 3:169:25; *uɫ-te-bi-ɫak-ku* 5:98:
r20'; *uɫ-te-⌈bɫ⌉* *6:3:42. The sole prec. form is Ass.:
ɫu-še-bi-ɫa 5:98:r11', whereas the imper. *šu-bi-ɫa* (ibid.:
r14'; *3:5:12; *6:12:10) is Bab. (vs. Ass. *šēbiɫa*).

v. *verbs I-y*

The only attestation of verbs usually called I-*y* in
Akk.[351] are from *edû* "to know," and the *š* of *ešēru* "to pro-
ceed." The former occurs only in the G pret., as a "pre-

---

[346]Cf *GAG* §21d. In MB, only *aw/mīɫu* is ever written
with medial *w*; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 33, n. 1.

[347]If *û(?)-tab-bi-[iɫ]* in 5:81:33 is correctly read, it
presumably represents a D perf. of *(w)abāɫu*, for which *CAD*
A/1, 24a, lists only one other occurrence, meaning "to jug-
gle." Perhaps this is another instance of the D replacing
the G (see above, p. 247). But the reading is very uncer-
tain; the first sign looks more like *MIŠ* than *Û*.

[348]See above, p. 70, and n. 175, for references.

[349]*GAG* §103t.

[350]The accompanying verb, *uraṣṣipšunu* would also have
to be future, one of several instances of the pret. replacing
the dur. (see below, pp. 345ff.). For that matter, *û-še-ši-
ib-šu-nu* might also be a pret. with future meaning.

[351]Cf. *GAG* §103e.

formative stative": *lu-ú i-de₄* (1s) 5:87f.:36, but [*lu*]-*ú*

i-de (3ms) ibid.:27; *ú-ul i(?)-[d]e* (3ms) ibid.:19; cf.

[*l*]*u-ú i-de₄-mi* (3ms?) *EA*45:34.[352] The *š* form may be dur.

or pret. (context broken): *ú-še-šar/šer₉* (1s/3ms) *EA*45:16.

If the form is dur., then, like *(t)ušebbal* (above), it is

Ass.

vi. *verbs II-w*

There are relatively few examples of these verbs. In

the G, note:

> dur.: *a-ma-at* *6:3:11; probably also [*i-tu*]-*ur-ra*[353]
> 5:180:13; pret.: *i-mu-ut* 5:5:7'; perf.: *id-du-uk-*
> *šu-nu-t[i]*[354] 3:97:22; stative: *mi-ta-ku* (glossing
> BA.UG₇) 3:76a:3.

Two examples could formally be either pret. or perf.: *i-du-*

uk-šu 3:68:9; *i-tù-ur* 5:10:26 (for *id(d)ūkšu, it(t)ūr*). The

tense of *i-zu-zu-ú* in 5:173:23 is not certain; it could be

dur. *izuzzū*, or pret. or perf. *iz(z)ūzū*.[355] Likewise, the

form *i-tu-ru-ni₇*, in 3:114:14; 3:170b:12, could also be any

of the three tenses.[356] In 5:185:2',4', the very unusual

---

[352]Cf. also *la-a te-i-de* in the poorly written *5:146:10.

[353]Unless the word *urra* "future" is intended. See below, p. 348, n. 642. Note also *i-tu-ur-[r]a/u* in a broken context in 3:73:21, and the pl. form *i-tu-ir-ru-ni₇* 6:39:13.

[354]On the final sign, see above, p. 199, n. 121.

[355]The extra -*ú* is unusual.

[356]See below, pp. 348f.

form *i-te-ru* occurs. The surrounding context is unintelligible, and of no help. The *e*-vowel remains problematic.

In the D, the following examples occur:

pret.: ⌈*i*⌉(?)-*za-i-zu-ni₇* [357] 3:66a:17; prec.: *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* *5:142:18; and probably *li!(UD)-te-er* *3:19:19; imper.: *t[e-e]r* (ms) *6:12:20; cf. *5:137:7;[358] *te-er-ri* (fs) 5:148:r9'.

Note that for all the forms that would differ in Bab. and Ass., the Bab. forms occur: *amāt* (Ass. *amūat*[359]), *liter-rūninni* (Ass. *luta'²erūni*[360]), *tēr/terrī* (Ass. *ta'²er(ī)*[361]).

No Š or N forms occur.

vii. *verbs II-y*

The only forms of verbs II-*y* are:

---

[357] On the prefix, and the use of the D as opposed to the G listed above, see pp. 246f.

[358] Note the very peculiar forms in *5:145f.:8,27 (see above, p. 165, n. 3): *ṭè-𝕏-er(-an-nu)*, presumably for *ṭēma tēr(ranni)* "return news (to me)." Nougayrol reads the second sign as *KUR*, and interprets the group as *ṭè-mate(?)-er(-an-nu)*. Far less plausible is the suggestion of P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2, 290), to read *ṭe-še-er(an-nu)*, i.e., **ṭēš-šer(rannu)*, with *ṭēma→ṭēm→ṭēn→ṭēš* before a spirantized *t* (→θ→š). A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 5, 28, suggests that both instances be emended to *ṭè<-ma> te!-er(-an-ni)*. This suffers from the fact that the scribe knew perfectly well how to make a proper *TE* sign (cf. *l*.10), and would be unlikely to make exactly the same two mistakes twice (omitting *-ma*, writing *ŠE* for *TE*).

[359] Cf., e.g., *a-mu-at*, listed in Mayer, *UGMa*, 78.

[360] Cf., e.g., *lu-ka-il*, ibid., 8.

[361] Cf., e.g., *ta-e-ra*, ibid.

pret.: *i-ši-im* "he decreed" 5:10:3; perf.: *ir-te-eh(?)*

"it remained" 6:96b:8(Ec.), but ventive(?) *ir-te-ha*[362]

6:104f.:*p.*(Ec.); note also *ir-te-hi* *3:10:10,21.

Since *-hi* occurs in both of the examples in *3:19, it should

probably not be emended to *-eh*. Either the scribe confused

râhu with *rehû*, or these are instances of "overhanging"

vowels (typically inexplicable).[363] The form *ištm* is both

Bab. and Ass.;[364] *irtēh(i)* is Bab. (the *e* is due to the

h[365]), since Ass. would have *irtīah*.[366]

viii. *verbs third weak*

There are of course a great many of these verbs. Some

examples:

G: dur.: *i-ra-aš-ši* 5:5:2'; *i-le-eq-qè-šu-nu* 3:109a:

14; *i-la-aq-qè* 3:145:30; *ti(te₉)-še-em-me* (2ms)

**EA47:22; *ta-laq-qè* 3:56:20; pret.: *iš-ši-šu* 3:

49a:12; *il-qè-šu* 3:92:20,21; perf.: *il-te-e*[367]

3:72a:7; *tâq-ta-bi* *5:141:9; *tâq-te-bi* *3:19:5;

il-te-qè 3:49b:20; *il-ta-qè* 3:86:5; prec.: *li-iq-bi*

---

[362]See above, p. 242, n. 294.

[363]Note, e.g., *û-ta-ri* for *utār* (another hollow verb)
in *En. El.* 4:71. This phenomenon is discussed by F.R. Kraus,
"Ein altbabylonischer '*i*-Modus'?" in M.A. Beek, et al., eds.,
*Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae F.M.Th. de Liagre Böhl
Dedicatae* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), 243ff.

[364]For Ass., cf. *i-ši-im*, cited in Mayer, *UGMa*, 78.

[365]*GAG* §9h.   [366]Cf. *GAG*, p. 33*, paradigm 27.

[367]See above, under verbs II-ʾ.

EA45:33; imper.: *qí-bi-ma* 3:4:2, and p.; *le-qè*
*5:137:8; stative: *na-ši* 5:176b:5; infin.: *le-qè-e*
5:20:2(Ec.); *la-qe-e* 5:81:12'.[368]

Gtn: stative: probably *hi-tá-ad-dí* 5:98:12.

D: dur.: *ú-ma-al-lu-ni₇* 3:37a:8, and often; pret.:
ú-za-(ak-)ki 3:11?b:12, and often; prec.: *li-ši-bu-ki*[369] 5:148:10.

Š: imper.: *šub-ši* 3:51:7.

N: pret.: perhaps *il-le!(TE)-qè*[370] *6:12:12.

The contrast between forms with *e* and forms with *a* in
the G is discussed at length above, pp. 181ff.; there it is
suggested that the forms with *a* are perhaps not Assyrianisms,
but analogous re-formations within U itself.

It should be noted that Bab. vowel contraction occurs
whenever a vocalic suffix is added; thus, in pl. forms: *i-qab-bu-û* "(if) they say" 3:114:19; *û-ze-ku-û* "they freed" 3:170b:13'; with subjunctive -*u*: *ša ir-šu-û* "which she(!) acquired" 3:110a:13; with f. -*at* in the stative: *na-da-at*

---

[368]Also *a-na tá!-mi-šu* 6:52:6. The text has *ID-mi-šu*;
however, the forms makes no sense after a preposition. *DA*
and *ID* are easily confused, and *DA* occurs for *tá* elsewhere
in U (e.g., *ha-tá-ad-di*, 5:98:12). A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 39,
suggests that *it-mi-šu* is for *atmîšu* "his pronouncement,"
and reads the main verb as *i-ba!-qar* "he shall not appeal."
In view of *ana tummî magãru* twice in K (4:167:18; 6:37:14),
however, this is unlikely.

[369]For *lišebbûki*, from *šebû*, in the D "to satisfy"; cf.
, 1229b (*šíbûtu* 1 e), 1207 (*šebû* G 3b, D 4). Note the
same expression in a text of unclear origin: *ši-[b]u-t[a]*
S[I]G₅[-ta(?) l]i-ši-b[u]-ka 5:131:4'.

[370]See above, p. 249.

"(the land) is overthrown" 5:87:25; *ṣa-kat* "is free (of

claims)" 3:62b:7; 3:86:22.[371]

    The final vowel of III-*a* and III-*u* forms has generally

been levelled to *i*.[372] Thus, note the perf. *it-ta-mi* "he

swore" *3:19:13,[373] for expected *ittama*;[374] the Gtn stative

ha-tâ-ad-dí "he rejoices" 5:98:12, for expected *hitaddu*.[375]

From the verb *ṣakû*, the stative in most Akk. dialects is

usually *ṣaku*, although *ṣaki* is also encountered.[376] But in

these texts, *ṣaku* is never found;[377] instead, *ṣaki* predomi-

_____

[371]Also *ṣa-kà-at* 3:110a:7; *ṣa-ka₄-at* 3:56:23. In 3:
111:11, we have *ki-i-me-e* [DN] *ṣa-ki-ti ki-i ṣa-ki-*[] FN;
it is more likely that the normal state of the adjective
occurred here (*ṣakî*[*ti*]), than that the predicate state
(stative) occurred, without contraction (*ṣaki*[*at*]).

[372]Cf. *GAG* §105d,f, for parallels.

[373]Note also in K: *it-t*[*a-m*]*i* 3:8:22; see above, p. 73.

[374]Cf. *AHw*, 1317b.

[375]The final -*u* is expected not because *hadû* is III-*u*,
but because the paradigmatic Gtn stative is *pitarrus*.

[376]*CAD* Z, 25ff. Both *ṣaku* and *ṣaki* occur in K; see
above, p. 73.

[377]*ṣa-ku* in 5:182:5' is probably pl. However, note the
f. verbal adjective (gen.) *ṣa-ku-ti Sy*18:253:10; usually, the
form is *ṣakîti*, as in 3:57:14; 3:111:11, or *ṣakâti*, as in 3:
66a:8; 5:15:r2',10' (all *ṣa-ka₄-ti*); 3:68:16 (*ṣa-ka-ti!*).
ṣakâti is an irregular formation; it is difficult to know if
it is based on the predicative *ṣakât* (e.g., 3:56:23), or if
it represents a Ugaritic lexeme (*ⁿðakiw/yati→*ⁿðakati; cf.
Hebrew m. *dāweh* "sick," f. *dāwāh*, probably from *dawiyu*,
dawiyatu respectively). The latter alternative is rendered
less likely by the fact that *ⁿðkw/y* does not appear in any
Ugaritic texts as yet. Moreover, a Ugaritic parallel to the
expression in question (*kīma* ᴰUTU-*ši ṣakīti ṣaki* PN) uses a
different root entirely; the Ugaritic text is *UT* 1005, p.
216, cited below, p. 266, n. 395.

nates.[378] However, there are also several examples of *zakâ*.
It was suggested above, p. 235, that the *a* might represent
WS **qatala*, rather than the ventive.

5. *Prepositions*

a. Simple Prepositions.

adi "until, up to": (always *a-di*) attested only in *adi dā-*
rīti, etc.; see below, pp. 279f.

ana "to, for": unless contracted (see below), always *a-na*;
used in general as in normal Akk.: e.g., dative: *u iddin-*
šu ana FN "and he gave it to FN" 3:53:7f., and *p.*; motion
toward something (Latin ad): *u itūr ana bīt abīšu* "he will
return to his father's house" 3:81:29f. (in this use, often
replaced by *ana muhhi*; see below); with an infinitive: e.g.,
ana ša'āli šulmi ša šarri "to inquire after the king's wel-
fare" 4:294:9f.; *ana epāše* "for building" 6:110a:2(Ec.);
"concerning": e.g., *ana eqlētīšunu* "concerning their fields"
3:114:15; etc. As a shortened proclitic, with *n* assimilated,
note *am-mi-ni-im-ma* (for *ana mīnim-ma*) "for what?, why?" *EA*
45:15 (see under section 6, below, s.v.); *as-sú-ri-im* (for
ana surrim[379]) "perhaps" *EA*45:30 (see under section 6, below,
s.v.); perhaps also *ak-kà-ši!*[380] (for *ana kâši*) "to you" *5:

---

[378]At least 14 examples, listed above, p. 235, and n.
263.

[379]*AHw*, 76a.

[380]See above, p. 191, n. 95.

137:19.[381] In **EA47:17, *ša* occurs for no apparent reason

in *ana ša yâši* "to me." *ana* also features in many preposi-

tional and adverbial expressions, for which see below. Oc-

casionally, *ana* occurs where *ina* is expected: e.g., *ana*

arki šarri [*ul ill*a[*k*]-*ma* "he will not go behind the king"

3:141:19f.; *ittadinšunu ana FN...ana X kaspi* "he gave them

to FN...for X silver" 3:61:7ff., vs. *ina X kaspi* e.g., 3:138:

5ff., and often (see under *ina*, below); *ana UD.MEŠ(-)TE*

balāṭ PN "for (all) the days of PN's life" 3:93b:13, but *ina*

in 3:92:13; 3:132:23.[382]

arki "after": only with *ana* in 3:141:19f., quoted under

ana, above; written EGIR-*ki*.

aššum "concerning": e.g., *aš-šum dīni ša PN* "concerning the

case of PN" 3:4:9; cf. *5:141:7f. With an infinitive,[383] it

means "in order to": *PN iš'am...aš-šum epēši u r*[*aṣāpi(?)*]

bīta... "PN bought (a field) in order to rebuild and repair(?)

the house..." 5:8f.:17ff.; in an economic text: *100 kaspu*

aš-šum le-qè-e uqnâ 100 silver for acquiring *u.*-wool" 5:

20:1ff.

---

[381]Perhaps also *a-da-ri-ti* (*ad-darīti*) "forever" 3:35a:
11, unless the text should be emended to *a*<-*na*> *da-ri-ti*,
since this is the only such example (see below, pp. 279f.).

[382]Note also *PN₁ PN₂ ana mār(ūt)īšu i*[*rkus*] "PN₁ bound
PN₂ in adoptive sonship" 3:71a:9f.; cf. 3:55:5f., but *PN₁...*
irkus PN₂ ina ahūtīšu 3:75a:4ff. No preposition, but rather
an adverbial acc., is used in 3:55:6; see below, pp. 363f.

[383]On the construction of the infinitive, see below,
pp. 359ff.

biri "between among": normally in Akk. this occurs after

ina,[384] as in *yānu rabû yānu ṣehru ⌈i-na bi-ri-šu-nu⌉* "There

is neither older nor younger between them" 5:173:5; cf. also

i-na be-ri 3 mārī⌈šu⌉ "among his 3 sons" 5:12:r5'. However,

it also occurs alone, in the same text as the first example:

gabbi ša ibašši bi-ri FN u bi-ri PN izūzū "They divided

everything between FN and PN" 5:173:21ff. In another pas-

sage, it occurs both alone and with *ana*,[385] in the same

clause: *u bīt(u)ya u eqlētūya gabba mimmūya ana bi-ri PN₁*

bi-ri PN₂ "My estate, my fields, all my property (is divided)

between PN₁ and PN₂" 5:11:6ff.[386]

eli "over, against": always written UGU.[387] It occurs

most often in non-verbal clauses of the type *X kaspu elīšu*

"X silver is against him," i.e., "he owes X silver,"[388] as

in 5:11:12; etc. Otherwise, note: *akil narkabti lā uma''er*

eli PN u eli mārīšu "The overseer of the chariotry may have

no power over him" 3:81:31ff.; cf. 3:135a:15f.; *kunuk šarri*

---

[384]*AHw*, 128a.

[385]*ana biri* is quite rare in Akk.; cf. *AHw*, 128a (*bīri*
5a). Perhaps this is another instance of *ana* replacing *ina*;
see above, under *ana*.

[386]Note also *⌉be-ri-šu-nu Sy*28:174:8

[387]Unless Thureau-Dangin is correct in taking *⌉e-li-ia*
in 3:111:11 to be the preposition plus a 1s suffix (*Sy* 18,
253). With *zakû*, this would mean "with regard to me" (see
below). In context, this is as plausible as Nougayrol's
⌈ᶠ⌉e-li-ia-⌈wa⌉, the FN who has been set free in this text.

[388]Cf. *AHw*, 201b (*eli* B 2).

eli tuppi "The royal seal is on the tablet" 3:101:heading.

Rarely, *eli* means "with regard to":[389]   *zaki PN eli bīt abīšu*

u eli ahhīšu "PN is free (of claims) with regard to his

father's estate and his brothers" 3:57:15f. In an economic

text, *eli* occurs with *nadānu*: *46 kur še'i ša nadin PN eli*

GN "46 kor of grain which PN gave to(?) GN" 6:92a:9ff.

ina: exhibits its normal range of meanings in U: e.g.,

locative: *eqlēt PN ša ina*[390] *eqel GN* 3:119:5,9, and often;

temporal: *ina ūmī(ti?) balāṭīšu* "for (all) the days of his

life" 3:92:13;[391] instrumental: e.g., *u PN GN iraṣṣap ina*

kaspīšu ina erīšu ina gabbi mimmīšu "PN will repair GN with

his own silver, copper (and) property" 3:112b:8ff. *ina* is

also used to express exchange (or price), like *kīmū* (q.v.):

e.g., *PN...ittadin X eqli...ina Y kaspi* "PN...gave X field...

for Y silver" 3:138b:4ff.; cf. 5:9:3ff.; 3:37b:1ff.; etc.

The use of *ina* for the ablative, which is common in normal

Akk.,[392] is sharply curtailed in U; normally, *ištu* (q.v.)

replaces it. However, note, e.g., *u šarru uzakki PN ina*

pilki "The king freed PN from feudal service" 3:112f.:12f.[393]

It was noted above that *ana* (q.v.) occasionally replaces an

---

[389]Cf. *AHw*, 201b (*eli* B 5).

[390]Always written *i-na*.

[391]Cf. also 3:132:23; but with *ana* in 3:93b:11. This
idiom is discussed below, p. 305, n. 502.

[392]*GAG* §114c; cf. *AHw*, 380b (*ina* B II 1).

[393]Compare *uzakkīšu šarru...ištu šipri...* 3:68:14f.

expected *ina*. *ina* also occurs in several prepositional

and adverbial expressions (see below).

ištu, ultu: the latter is rare in U; occasionally both ap-

pear in the same text, e.g., 3:62:5,8. As in K, (above, pp.

76f.), this preposition has both its normal Akk. meanings

and the nuances of some other prepositions, especially *ina*.

Thus, as in regular Akk., it means "out of, away from" lo-

cally, as in *ištu bītīša l[ā] uṣṣi* "does not wish to leave

her house" 3:55:17; temporally, as in *ištu ūmi annîm* "from

this day" *p*. It usually replaces *ina* with *zakû*:[394] e.g.,

zaki PN ištu pilki "PN is free of feudal service" 3:46:11f.,

and *p*.; also in *ištu libbi mārī PN₁ ištu ahhīšu ša PN₂*

"among PN₁'s sons, PN₂'s brothers" 3:102:13f. It replaces

either *ina* or *itti* with *leqû*:[395] e.g., *ilteqûni X eqla...*

ištu PN "took X field...from PN" 5:9:4ff., and *p*. (usually

---

[394]With *ina*, cf. 3:112f.:12f., quoted above (*ina*); also, see above, p. 77, and n. 196 there. Cf. also the next note.

[395]See, e.g., CAD L, 138ff.; AHw, 380b (*ina* B II 1b), 544b (*leqû* G 2b). These uses of *ištu* rather than *ina* are probably related in some way to the fact that in Ugaritic the preposition *b* covers the ranges of both *ištu* and *ina*; cf. UT §10.1, pp. 92f., where Gordon notes this as well. Nevertheless, the consistency in the use of *ištu (qāti)* with *leqû*, but never for *ina* when the sense is locative or dative, is troublesome. A Ugaritic text, which contains parallels to two frequent clauses where *ištu* is used for *ina* in U Akk., is probably a translation from the Akk.; one is: *km . špš / dbrt . kmt . / br . PN / bunθ . ᶜd ᶜlm* "Like DN who is pure, likewise PN is free (lit.: pure) of feudal service forever" UT 1005:2ff., p. 216; cf. 3:46:11f., just cited above. The other is: *wmnkm . lyqḥ / spr . mlk . hnd / byd . PN / ᶜd ᶜlm* "And no one may take this royal document from PN forever" ibid.:12ff.; cf. *mamman lā ilaqqe nidnūti annûti ištu qāti PN...adi dārīti* 3:145:30ff.

ištu qāti; see below). See also the prepostional and adver-

bial expressions listed below.

itti "with": usually *it-ti* ; e.g., *PN...dīna itti PN₂...*
iṣṣabat "PN₁...started a legal case with PN₂..." 3:71b:5,

and often, involving lawsuits "with" or "against" someone

(cf. also with *namāšu* 3:81:26f.); with *nakāru*: *nakir PN*

itti šarri "PN was at war with the king" 3:68:7f.; cf. *EA*45:

21; etc. In one instance, *itti* means "including": *amīlu*

šanû...lā summuh ina eqli annî itti FN u itti mārīsa "No one

else...may have a share in this field, including FN and her

children" 3:114:26ff. In 5:148, the preposition is written

it-tu (*ll*.14,15,r7').[396]

kī (once *kī ša*[397]): used only in adverbial expressions:[398]

with the gen.: *ki-i damqi*(SIG₅-*qí*) *ki-i ṭābi*(DU₁₀.GA) "pro-

perly (and) politely" *3:5:27; with the terminative-adverbial:

ki-i ša ṭābiš(DU₁₀.GA-*iš*) 5:98:r5'; cf. also *ki-i* SIG₅.GA

ibid.:r7'.

kīma "like, as": almost always in the expression *ki-ma DN*

zakīti zaki "he is pure (i.e., free of claims) like pure DN,"

or, "...as pure as..." 3:57:14f., and often. Once, it is

---

[396]*CAD* I/J, 302, notes that *ittu(m)* occurs in OAk and
OB; in *l*.14, where [*i*]*t-tu* must mean "with me," perhaps we
should read *it-tu*<-*ia*>.

[397]Cf. *CAD* K, 324f. (*kī*, prep., c).

[398]Cf. *CAD* K, 324b (*kī*, prep., b).

used like *kīmū* (q.v.): [*bī*]*ta ki-ma* [*biti*] "house (in ex-
change) for house" 3:164b:9.

kīmê: only once, in place of *kīma*: *ki-i-me-e* [*DN*] *zakīti*
3:111:10.

kīmū "in exchange for": e.g., *u iddinšu ana PN ki-i-mu-ú*
eqlīšu "and gave it to PN in exchange for his field" 3:46:9f.;
cf. 3:62:6; 3:151a:10. Once it is used where *ina* normally
occurs: *maškana...ana PN iddinšu ki-mu 800 kaspi* "He gave
the lot...to PN for 800 silver" 3:103:15f.; cf. *ina 400*
kaspi iddin ibid.:18f.

qadu "together with": written *qa-du*, *qa-dû*, or *qa-du₄*, and
occurring only in descriptions of property in legal transac-
tions: e.g., *eqel : hu-li*[399] *qadu dimtīšu qadu serdīšu...*
"the field of *h.*, together with its tower, its olive-trees,
etc." 3:143ff.:4f., and *p.*; and *p.* in many texts.

b. Compound Prepositions.[400]

    With the exception of *ina libbi*, all of these govern
only nouns or pronouns referring to persons; this may be
fortuitous. The forms are listed alphabetically, first by
the noun, then by the preposition.

biri: for *ana biri* and *ina biri*, see above, under *biri* alone.

---

[399]On this form, see C. Kühne, *UF* 6, 166f.

[400]A definition in given in the K section, above, p. 79.

lētu: does not occur in prepositional expressions.

libbu: ana libbi: only in *ana libbīšu târu* "to go back on one's decision, change one's mind," e.g., *šumma...PN u mārūšu itūrūni ana libbīšunu ana eqlēttīšunu* "if...PN and his sons go back on their intention concerning their fields" 3:114: 13ff.; cf. 5:9f.:15ff.; 5:179f.:7ff.; etc.

      ina libbi:[401] roughly equivalent to the locative use of *ina*, used especially before GN's; e.g., *tuppāti sar-rūti ina libbi GN išaṭṭurū* "they were writing false tablets in (the midst of) GN" 3:97:17ff.

      ištu libbi:[402] "among," equivalent to *ištu* with the same meaning in *mamman ištu libbi mārī PN₁ ištu ahhīšu ša PN₂* "no one among PN₁'s sons, among PN₂'s brothers" 3: 102:12ff.

mahru: does not occur in any prepositional expressions.

muhhu: ana muhhi:[403] equivalent to *ana* in its allative use, i.e., especially with verbs of motion, e.g., *šapāru* (*3:5:9f.; 5:98:r12'; etc.); *qerēbu* (5:10:r12'); etc. Often clauses with *ana* plus a noun are paralleled by others with *ana muhhi* plus a pronoun:[404] *mamma ana PN lā iraggum* "No

_____

    [401]Cf. *GAG* §115d; Aro, *SMbG*, 103.

    [402]Cf. *GAG* §115d; Aro, *SMbG*, 104.

    [403]This is a MB/MA idiom; cf. *GAG* §115h; Aro, *SMbG*, 105f.; Mayer, *UGMa* §6.2.c.b', p. 100.

    [404]Cf. *CAD* M/2, 175 (*muhhu* 2 c).

one may contest against PN" 3:70:10ff., but *mamman ana muhhīšu lā iraggum* "...against him" 3:169:18 (but *ana muhhi amīli* 3:54a:14f.).

ina muhhi: not attested.

ištu muhhi: used with *zakû* as a synonym for *ištu* (q.v.); in the same text, note: *zaki amīlu ištu amīli* "Each is free (of claims) from the other" 3:82:19, but *zaki PN₁ ištu muhhi PN₂ ahīšu* ll.12f. *ištu* is much more common than *ištu muhhi* in this expression.[405]

panū: *ana panī*[406] "before, in the presence of": *p.* in legal texts, referring to persons witnessing the transaction: e.g., *ištu ūmi annīm ana panī RN/šībūti PN...ipšur* "From this day, before RN/witnesses, PN...released..." 3:127:1ff.; 5:8:1ff. Other examples are: *u bēl(u)ya ana panī šarri bēltya liqbi* "May my lord speak in the presence of the king my lord" 5: 98:r8'f.; *u bēl(u)ya PN...ana panī šarrīšu qarr[ib]šu* "My lord, present PN...to his king" *3:5:26ff.

ina panī: not attested.[407]

ištu panī "from": rarely, with *leqû*: *u PN ultu panī šarri tuppa ilteqe* "PN received a tablet from the king" 3: 49:19f.; cf. 3:59b:r11'f.

---

[405]Other occurrences of *ištu muhhi*, all with *zakû*, are 3:54a:10,12; 3:62:7,9; 3:102:20. Note also *ištu muhhīya* **EA46:11.

[406]Cf. *GAG* §115 l; Aro, *SMbG*, 107f.

[407]*ina panī* is also not listed for MB in Aro, *SMbG*, 107f.

qātu: ana qāti: as a substitute for *ana*, especially with
nadānu,[408] when the object of the verb is *kaspu*, and the ob-
ject of the phrase is a PN (i.e., not *šarru*): *u PN 20 kaspa
ana qāti FN...ittadin* "PN gave 20 silver to FN..." 5:15:r4'ff.;
1000 kaspa inaddin ana qāti PN u qāti mārtšu 3:75:14f.; cf.
also 3:55:9f.; 3:106:11ff. Contrast the following clauses:
*u iddinšu ana PN ardīšu 1500 kaspa ana šarri iddin...2000
1000 hurāṣa ana qāti PN iddin* "...and gave it (estate and
fields) to PN his servant. He (PN) gave 1500 silver to the
king...(whoever starts legal procedings) will give 2000 sil-
ver (and) 1000 gold to PN" 3:92:7ff. Presumably, these
clauses indicate that *ana qāti* was not completely idiomatic;
one cannot physically hand over an estate (but see *ištu qāti,*
below); nor did one normally give money directly to (into
the hand of) the king, but rather to an official. (Neverthe-
less, *ina qāti šarri,* and occasionally *ana qāti šarri,* do
occur with *mullû*; see below.) But money obviously would be
passed "hand to hand" from one citizen to another. Perhaps
ana qāti should be translated "directly to." Once, *ana qāti,*
probably a mistake for *ina qāti* (q.v.), denotes agency:
imēra šâšu ana qāti PN...t[ē]r "Return that ass with PN..."
*6:12:17ff.

ina qāti: like *ana qāti,* used for the dative, espe-
cially with *mullû* (but not usually with *nadānu*[409]): e.g.,

---

[408]Also with *mullû* (see below); in 3:38b:3f., with the
unintelligible ⌈x⌉-ŠUK(?)-*li-im,* for which Nougayrol suggests
û(??)-šat_x(??)-li-im "a remis."

[409]Note, however, *ina qāti abīšu tittadin* 6:25:14f.

100 kaspa umalli i[n]a qāti ahhīšu "He will pay 100 silver to his brothers" 5:176f.:7f.; cf. 6:40:15f.; but note also *X kaspa lumal[li] ana qāti PN* 5:7:5'. Unlike *ana qāti nadānu*, *ina qāti mullû* may occur with *šarru*, as in 3:37a:7f., 16f.; 6:50:17f.; 6:53:r7'f.[410] (but *...umallûni ana šarri* 6:52a:r5'f.). *ina qāti* is also used once with *uppulu*, with the same force, in 3:162b:7f. (but, again, *uppulu ana* in 3:80:19.) In a nominal clause, note: *eqlēt GN₁...ša ina qāti amēli GN₂* "the fields of GN₁..., which belong to the men of GN₂" 3:91a:8'ff., cf. 6',7',11'. But in economic texts, where it is frequent, *ina qāti* seems to mean "owed by" (equivalent to *eli*?): e.g., 3:194f.:*p*. Finally, it rarely denotes agency:[411] *u 2 sisî damqūti...lušēbila ana ardīka ina qāti PN...* "that he send your servant...2 fine horses with PN" 5:98:r9'ff., cf. r13'ff. (but replaced by *ana qāti* in *6:12:17, quoted above).

    ištu qāti "from": especially in the extremely frequent *mamma(n) lā ila/eqqēšu(nu) ištu qāti PN*[412] "No one may take it/them from PN," usually referring to real estate, unlike *ana/ina qāti*, e.g., 3:60b:18f., and *p*. Very rarely, *ištu* alone occurs, e.g., in 3:146a:6ff. In a very few instances, *ištu qāti* is also used with *zakû*, exactly like *ištu muhhi* (q.v.), e.g., 3:84:22f.; 3:86:17f.

---

[410]Probably also 5:180:10f.,15f.

[411]Cf. *AHw*, 911a (*qātu* E 1).

[412]For a Ugaritic parallel, see above, p. 266, n. 395.

6. *Adverbs*

a.   The following are the simple adverbs attested in U:

adīni "until now, as yet": probably in ⌈a-d⌉*i-ni ul*
ikšudanni "they have still not reached me" 5:87:24.

akanna A "thus, as follows": e.g., *a-kán-na iqabbû* "(if)
they say as follows" 3:114:19, and often. Note the WPA
variant in a probable U text from Amarna: *kán-na-am-m*⌈a⌉
**EA46:5'. In *EA*45:13, read probably ⌈a-k⌉*án^{an}-na-am* (W.L.
Moran).

akanna B "here": only in *imēru ša illeqe! ultu a-kán-na*
"the ass which was taken from here" *6:12a:11ff. *akanna*
with this meaning is not attested elsewhere until NB.[413]

*akkaya (*5:137:19): see above, p. 191, n. 95.

ammaka "there": ⌈n⌉*āra am-ma-ka ul ibber* "he will/may not
cross the river there" 3:73a:13; *u eqel* PN *am-ma-ka-*⌈m⌉*a*
"and the field of PN there" 3:48:15. Note that *ammaka* is
Ass.[414]

am-mīni "why?" (from *ana mīni*): always in broken contexts:
*am-mi-ni-im-ma EA*45:15; *am-mi-ni-mi* ibid.:23; *am-mi-ni₇*
**EA46:7'.

---

    [413]So *AHw*, 27b. *CAD* A/1, 260 gives MB *a-ka-nu* once,
but *AHw*, 28a, lists this separately.

    [414]*CAD* A/2, 66f.; the word also occurs at Boghazkoy.

annaka "here": *an-na-ka asû yānu* "There is no physician here" *EA* 49:24f. Like *ammaka*, this word is Ass.[415]

anumma "now, hereby": followed by an injunctive (prec. or imper.) or the perf., rarely by the pret. (see below, p. 343); e.g., *a-nu-um-ma...ultēbilakku* "I hereby send to you..." 5:98:rl7ff., and often. With *inanna*, it always appears second.

anummê: once, instead of *anumma*: *Sy*18:249:4. The following word, *mīnum-mê*, may have affected the ending of the adverb.[416] Note *anumma* later in the same text, *l*.14.

appūna "moreover": *ap-pu-na-ma* 3:102:12; cf. 3:52a:ll. *appūna(-ma)* introduces a new thought; it seems to indicate a less substantial break than *šanīta* (q.v.), however.

arkānašu: only in *šanita PN zaki kīma DN ana dāritti ar-kā-na-šu zaki* "Moreover PN is free (of claims) like DN forever; he is free hereafter(?)" 3:70:17ff. *CAD* A/2, 273, lists the word with *(w)arkānu* "later on." Both the form and the nuance here are unique, and difficult to explain.

assurrim "heaven forbid":[416a] only in *šanīta as-su-ri-im* [*šar GN(?)*] *ittīya inakkir* "Heaven forbid that the king of GN(?) will make war against me" *EA* 45:30f.

---

[415]This word is also found at Boghazkoy, and in Amarna letters from Byblos and Amurru; see *CAD* A/2, 126.

[416]The same form occurs once in a text written in Amurru, *PRU* 4:141:5.

[416a]See the discussion of this word by Moshe Held in *JCS* 15 (1961), pp. 20f.

aš̌rānu "there": e.g., *amīli ša aš̌-ra-nu itt[ī]ka w]ašib* "the men living there with you" *5:137:6f., cf. 19. The word is common in OB (Mari and Shemshara) and WPA.[417]

atta(?): as Nougayrol notes (*PRU* 3, 19, n. 2), this cannot be the 2ms pronoun: *šanīta īterub at-ta ana bīt ilāni* "Moreover he has now(??) entered the temple" *3:19:10ff. Nougayrol compares the form, which is unique in Akk. if it is an adverb, with Hebrew *ᶜattāh* "now." However, that word appears in Ugaritic as *ᶜnt*,[418] and so the matter must remain unresolved.

ayya/ikām-ma: normally vocalized *ay(y)akamma* in the dictionaries,[419] and found only in OA, the word means "somewhere, anywhere," the indefinite counterpart of Ass. *ay(y)a-ka(m)*[420] "where?". In U it occurs only in *tēma [a(?)-i]a/ yī-ka-am-ma*[421] *šupr[a]nni* "Send me news ..." 5:88:34f. Nougayrol translates the form "[de quelque] manière(?)"; this is undoubtedly the correct direction of interpretation. The writer, the king of Ugarit, is desperate, under attack; he is seeking support from his ally, the king of Cyprus. It is

---

[417]Cf. *CAD* A/2, 453f.

[418]*UT* §1888, p. 458.

[419]*CAD* A/1, 224; *AHw*, 24a; cf. *GAG* §118b.

[420]*CAD* A/1, 232f.; *AHw*, 24a.

[421]For *IA=yī*, cf. *AS³*, no. 104. In a text found at Ras Shamra, probably written in Khatti, note *a-yī-iš-am-me-e* "somewhere" *PRU* 4:222:28.

much more likely that the adverb in question means "somehow, any way (possible)" here, rather than "somewhere." If so, it is probably not related to the OA *ayyakam-ma*.[422]

danniš "greatly, much": normally written *dan-niš*, e.g., 3:4:8(bis), etc.

dāriš "forever": see below, section b.

enūma: possibly, as in K (see above, pp. 141f.), the word has lost its subordinating function, and has become an adverb used to introduce the business of a document: e.g., *bēlī e-nu-ma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka mā...* "My lord: now then, the king my lord has written to your servant (saying)..." *3:5:9ff. The evidence is not sufficient to be certain that it is not a conjunction, however. See further below, pp. 338f.[422a]

inanna "now (then)": occasionally with its originally temporal meaning, as in *šanīta 2 bītāt PN₁ ša [ina] panānu ana PN₂ i-na-an-na šarru ana PN₃ iddinšu* "Moreover the 2 houses of PN₁, which formerly belonged to PN₂, the king has now given to PN₃" 3:103:13f. Often, however, it is more an interjection than an adverb, as noted in *CAD* I/J, 144a: e.g., *i-na-an-na šumma...elepp[ētu]...ibaššī-mi* "Now then, if... ships...are present" 5:88:32ff., and often.

---

[422] Perhaps the word in this case is composed of *ayyû* "which?" plus *kīam* "thus" plus -*ma* (making it indefinite): "in some manner."

[422a] Cf. also W.L. Moran, *OrNS* 29 (1960), p. 17, n. 1.

ištēn(šu), ittīlta "firstly, in the first place": an adverbial acc.; see below, pp. 364f.

kâm-ma: see *kīam*, below.

kannam(-ma): see *akanna* A, above.

kī "how?": perhaps in *ki-i šaknakk[u]* "How is it established for you?(?)" 5:98:13. In 3:111:11, *kī* apparently replaces *kīam* (q.v.): *kīmê* [DN] *zakīti ki-i zakī[ti(?)]* FN "FN is as pure as pure DN."[423]

kīam "thus": written with a medial glide, i.e., without MB contraction of *ia* to *â*, in *ki-ia-am* EA45:23, *AnOr48:23:8; both with *qabû* "...spoke as follows." With *-ma*, contraction has occurred: *u mātu ka-am-ma nadât* "And in that way the country is overthrown" 5:87:25.[424]

kīšū-ma "likewise": only in *u ki-šu-ma šunū-ma* "they (will be treated) likewise" 5:10:23, and probably *ki-i-šu-ma ka-[* 3:172b:3'. This adverb occurs elsewhere only in the Amarna letters from Byblos.[425]

---

[423]Perhaps this use of *kīmê...kī* should be compared with the Hebrew construction employing *kə...kə*: e.g., *kā-mōkā kə-par^cōh* "You are like Pharaoh" Genesis 44:18; cf. Joüon, *GHB* §174i, p. 528. The change of *kīmê* to *kī* remains difficult, however.

[424]Perhaps also *ka-a-ma* 5:81:14 (broken context); the form is written the same way in a K text, 4:155:19. But here perhaps [DAM].GÀR-*ka-a-ma* "your trader" should be read, as suggested by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 286.

[425]Cf. *EA* II, 1441; *CAD* K, 465a.

lā (negative): see below, pp. 319ff.

mašna: only in *ištu ūmi ann[îm...] PN₁ mār [PN₂...] ittaši bîtšu [...] ma-aš-na bîtšu [...] u ittadin[...]* 3:109:1ff. Nougayrol and the dictionaries[426] take the word to mean "secondly." It is probably a Ugaritic word, adverbial acc.; cf. *mθn* "repetition" *UT* 51:1:20, p. 170.[427]

panānu "formerly": only in *2 bîtāt PN₁ ša [ina] pa-na-nu ana PN₂* "the 2 houses of PN₁ which formerly belonged to PN₂" 3:103:13. Nougayrol's restoration of the preposition is probably correct; *panānu* is often preceded by a preposition, especially in WPA.[428] In 5:10:24, Nougayrol has restored a form *panāna(m)-ma* in *šanîta [pa-na]-na-ma eqlu annû ša PN abi FN u inanna eqlu itūr ana FN* "Moreover this field was formerly PN the father of FN's, and now the field has returned to FN." This restoration is also quite likely, even though *panāna(m-ma)* is not attested elsewhere.

pîqat "perhaps": in *...i]qb[î] pî-qa-at [aballuṭ(?) u(?)] pî-qa-at amāt* "...he said: perhaps I would live(?) and(?) perhaps I would die" *6:3:10f.

šanâm(-ma) and *ina šanîšu* "secondly, in the second place": see below, pp. 364f.

---

426 *CAD* M/1, 381b; *AHw*, 628b.

427 Cf. *šanîta*, *šanâm-ma*, below, pp. 364f.

428 Cf. *AHw*, 818a; *EA* II, 1488. For locative-adverbial -*u(m)* after *ina*, cf. *GAG* §66c.

šanîta "secondly; moreover": originally an adverbial acc.
Occasionally, it retains its original meaning "secondly,"
and is a synonym of *šanâm*; see below, pp. 364f. Most often,
however, its meaning is weakened to "moreover," and it is
frequently used to introduce new paragraphs, *p*.

šēra(m): see *urra(m)*, below.

ṭābiš "politely, well": only in *kî ša* DU$_{10}$.GA-*iš* 5:98:r5'.

ul (negative): see below, pp. 319ff.

umma "thus": indicating direct speech; see below, p. 282.

urra(m): only in the very common *urra(m) šēra(m)*[429] "in fu-
ture."[430] The two words are in fact adverbial acc.'s.
urra(m) šēra(m) normally stands first in a clause, although
it is preceded by *šanîta*, and usually (but not always) by
šumma.[431]

b. Expressions for "Forever."

The following combinations are attested:

    adi dāri dūri: only in 3:134:7; 5:9:14f.
    adi dāriš: only in 3:126:10.[432]

---

[429]Written in a variety of ways; see above, pp. 187,
207, for examples.

[430]Cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, *Sy* 18, 252, n. 1; *AHw*, 1219a.

[431]Note the Ugaritic equivalent, or translation, *šḥr*
ᶜlmt, also at the head of the clause, in *UT* 1008:15, p. 217.

[432]Note also [*ana/adi d*]*āriš* 3:108:22.

adi dārīt: only in 5:263:13.

adi dārīti:[433] 3:118:18; 3:120:r5',9'; 3:148a:14,18, and often.

ana dāri dūri: 3:49:14; 3:53b:19; 3:65b:9,13, and often.

ana dāriš: only in 3:147a:8.[434]

ana dārīti:[433] 3:87:r5',11'; 3:90b:15; 3:96:19, and often.

ana dārītim-ma: only in 3:48a:9; 3:50a:10,14.

Note also *ad-dārīti* (*a-da-ri-ti*) 3:35a:11, unless *a<-na>* is to be read; and ⌈*ana dār*⌉*i(?) dārītīšu* 3:100:10.

All of the examples with *adi* occur in texts from the reign of Ammistamru, or later (i.e., Ibiranu[435] or Niqmaddu III[436]), or in undated texts.[437] Examples with *ana*, however, occur in all reigns. In some texts, more than one form is found: e.g., 3:64a:6,11; three different forms occur in 3:149a:8,9,12.

The expression for "(since) always" is *ultu dārīti* in 3:91:5',9'.

---

[433]Also *dāritti*, usually with *ana*: e.g., 3:70:19; 3:74b:8; 3:84:19; etc.

[434]See n. 432, above.

[435]E.g., 3:167:18.

[436]E.g., 6:44f.:13,20,25.

[437]E.g., 5:9:4f.; 5:263:13. A reasonable assumption, then, is that those undated texts are from the reigns of those later kings.

7. *The Enclitic Particle* -mê[438]

In U, this particle forms the indefinite pronouns *minum-mê* "anything, whatever" and *mannum-mê* "anyone, who-ever."[439] The preposition *kîmê* occurs only once (3:111:10), replacing *kîma* (see above, pp. 267f.); it is not attested as a conjunction. The only other occurrence of *-mê* is in *anummê*, which appears once (*Sy*18:249:4), instead of *anumma*; see above, p. 274, s.v.

Thus, it appears that *-mê* is less common in U than in K.

8. *Markers of Direct Speech*

Most quotations are introduced by *mā* (*ma-a*), usually after the verb *qabû*: e.g., [PN] *ana ahhîšu u* [...] *akanna iqtebi mā anumma X kaspu annû šîm(u)ya ša taltaqû-mi* "PN said to his brothers and...as follows: 'Now then, this X silver is my price which you have taken'" 3:170b:4ff.;[440] once, after *šapāru*: *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardîka mā 1600 šiltāhî šūbilam-mi* "Now the king my lord has written to your servant: 'Send 1600 arrows'" *3:5:9ff. Once, the quote follows *qabû* directly, without *mā*: *ištu ūmi annîm RN šar GN akanna iqtabi šumma...* "From this day

---

[438]For the spelling, see the examples on pp. 177f.

[439]Note that *mannum-ma* also occurs (see above, 205ff.). It is interesting to observe, however, that only the form with *-mê* serves as an independent antecedent of *ša* for the notion of the general relative, or as the general relative pronoun itself.

[440]Cf. also *3:19:5f.; 3:114:20(bis); *5:141:9f.

RN king of GN said: 'If...'" 3:76a:1ff.

In three legal texts, a quotation is introduced with
the phrase *šanīta umma PN* "moreover, thus PN (said)": 3:80:
20ff.; 3:82:22ff.; 3:86:20ff. And, of course, *umma* occurs
p. in letter introductions: *ana X qibī-ma umma Y(-ma)* or
umma Y ana X(-ma) qibī-ma "Speak to X; thus (says) Y" e.g.,
3:4:1ff.; 5:147:1ff. *umma* is regularly followed by the gen.;
see above, p. 219.[441]

In another text, the only notice of the following
quote is the conjunction *u*: *PN...uwaššer FN amatšu...u*[442]
aštapak šamna ana qaqqadīša... "PN...released FN his servant
...and: 'I have poured oil on her head...'" 3:110b:3ff.
Finally, in one text, there is no indication at all of the
beginning of direct speech: *FN šarratu GN itti PN₁ mār PN₂*
pūhuka šubši... "FN, queen of GN, with PN₁, son of PN₂
(spoke): 'Present your exchange...'" 3:51b:4ff.

The particle *-mi*, indicating that the clause in which
it occurs is a quote, is usually written with *MI* (19 times),
but occasionally with *ME* (five times);[443] in *3:19, each

---

[441]The fact that *umma* is followed by the gen. in WPA
does not mean that it must be understood as an Akkadogram
for some WS word that is a noun, such as *tḥm*, as suggested
by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1, 218. Rather, it merely indicates
that *umma* was construed in the same way as such a WS word.
Cf. also the pertinent remarks of A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 5, 22f.,
n. 25.

[442]Nougayrol's suggestion (his n. 4), to read this sign
as KIMIN, meaning *akanna*, is not convincing.

[443]On *i* vs. *e*, see above, pp. 177ff.

occurs three times (the other examples are referred to below).
The particle is used very inconsistently. In the letters,
it appears at least once in each quote: e.g., *3:5:9ff.,
quoted above; *kī taqteb[i] mā...lugammir-mi* "when you wrote
me: '...let me finish'" (verbs in intervening clauses broken
at end) *5:141f.:9ff.[444] In legal texts, however *-mi* occurs
in only three quotations:[445] 3:170b:14ff. (quoted above);
šanīta umma PN₁ anummā-mi bīt sisî u...ana PN₂ "Moreover,
thus PN₁ (said): 'Now, the stable and...belong to PN₂'" 3:80f.:
20ff.; in 3:114:20, *mā* plus a short quote occurs twice, but
only in the first does *-mi* appear: *(šumma...iqabbû) mā ul
bēlni attā-mi mā šarru šanû bēlni* "(if...they say:) 'You
are not our lord; another king is our lord'." In six other
instances of direct speech, *-mi* does not occur; note, e.g.,
3:51b:4ff.; 3:76a:1ff.; 3:110b:3ff., all quoted above, and
3:82:27f.; 3:86:20f.; 5:176b:3ff.[446] The reasons for the
use or non-use of *-mi*, and for the disparity between the
letters and the legal texts, are unclear.

The particle also appears several times outside direct
speech, in both text types: *PN₁ itti PN₂...pūhata īpuš
iššī-mi PN₁...u iddinšu* "PN₁ made an exchange with PN₁...;

---

[444]Cf. also *3:19:7; *5:112:11',12'; *-mi* occurs five
times in *EA*45 (*ll.*23,24,28,34bis), probably always in direct
speech; but the text is too broken to be certain.

[445]Perhaps also 5:15:rl',2'.

[446]In 5:173:26, the text breaks after the verb, and so
-mi may or may not have appeared.

PN₁ took...and gave it" 3:45f.:3ff.; *PN...ittadin-mi...sakûni
...saki...ša dīna iqabbat-mi...iddin* "PN...gave...; they are
free...; (each is) free...; whoever brings suit...will give"
3:54:5ff.; *šumma eleppᴸētuᴶ ša nakrt šanātᴸiᴶ ibaššt-mi* "if
there are other ships of the enemies" 5:88:32ff.; *ittami adi*
lā iddin-mi[447] *ardtka* "he swore, as long as he has not given
your servants" *3:19:13f.; *u kaspa ša ușși ištu qāttka anad-*
din-mi u ardtya ana yâši litēr!-mi u X kasapka ša irtēhi
idin-mi u lā tašakkan hubullam-mi ina bertni ištēn amtlu
ntnu "And I will give (you) the silver that 'leaves your
hand.' Only let him return my servants to me. So give the
X silver that remains (owing), and do not put interest be-
tween us; we are one man" ibid.16ff. This last text (*3:19)
also has *-mi* once in a quote (*l*.7); in the other texts, *-mi*
does not otherwise occur. I can find no explanation or mean-
ing for the particle in these examples. Perhaps in some
cases it corresponds to the equally obscure Ugaritic encli-
tic *m*.[448]

9. *Assyrian Forms*

There are more Assyrianisms in U than were noted for K,
but considering the difference in the number of texts under
consideration, the proportion of Assyrianisms in U is only
slightly greater. Very few of them are the norm for a given
feature; rather, they are usually isolated phenomena that

[447]Here in an indirect quote.

[448]Cf. *UT* §11.4-8, pp. 103f.

appear alongside more frequently attested Bab. forms.

(i) The anaphoric/third person independent pronouns šūt, šuwāti, šīt occur six times altogether, while Bab. šū, šâšu are found eight times.[449]

(ii) The 3mp acc. pronominal suffix is Bab. -šunūti eight times, but Ass. -šunu many times on nadānu and leqû throughout the legal texts, in addition to five other instances.[450] The only attestation of a 2mp acc. suffix is Ass. -kunu (*5:146:23).

(iii) The Ass. nominal ending -uttu[451] occurs in the following forms: LUGAL-ut-ta "kingship" *6:3:25; qal-lu-ut-ti-ka "your service(?)" *5:137:5,8; LÚ.MEŠDAM.GÀR-ut-ti "position of merchant" or "merchants" 6:32:10. The f. ending -itti[451] occurs in: a-na da-ri-it-ti "forever" 3:70:19; 3:84:19. For Bab., note, e.g., an-nu-û-ti 6:45:27; LÚ.MEŠmar-ia-nu-ti[452] 6:33:23; ana/adi da-ri-ti[452] 3:87:r5'; 6:45:20, and p.

(iv) There are several Ass. verb forms; but, again, there are considerably more that are strictly Bab. The following lists all the Assyrianisms that are certain; Bab. forms (not exhaustive) are given in parentheses.

---

[449]See above, pp. 202ff.

[450]Above, p. 198f.

[451]GAG §20d.

[452]These forms could of course also be Ass., due to the non-indication of doubled consonants, which is especially pervasive in U.

dur.: *i-ša-aṭ-ṭù-ru* 3:97:19 (but *il-la-ku-ni[m-m]a*

        *6:3:28; *li-iš-la-mu-ka* 5:148:9; etc.);

    e-ep-pa-aš *6:3:26 (but probably *i-ru-ub* 3:107:

        8, unless this is pret.; perf. *i-te-ep-šu*

        i-te-ru-ub *3:19:11);

    ù-še-ra-ab 3:107:13 (but probably *ù-še-re-eb*

        3:82:17, unless this is pret.);

    ù-še-bal 5:98:10; probably *tu-še-bá-[al]* EA45:

        28 (but imper. *šu-bi-la* 5:98:r4'; *3:5:12);

    possibly *ù-še-šar* EA45:16 (but equally possibly

        pret. *ù-še-šer₉*);

prec.: *lu-ù-ma-[al-li]* (3ms) 5:7:5' (but *li-ši-bu-ki*

        (3mp) 5:148:10; all other D 3ms/p prec.'s

        are Bab.[453]);

    [l]u-še-bi-la 5:98:r11'; *lu-še-ri-ib-š[u]*

        ibid.:r4' (but *li-še-r[i-ib-šu]*

        ibid.:r7'; no other Š prec.'s occur);

imper.: *qar-ri-[ib]-šu* *3:5:28 (but *gu₅-mi-ir* *5:142:7);

stative: probably *ta-din* 6:110a:2(Ec.) (but *na-din* 6:

        108:3,6(Ec.); 3:68:6(J), and often; all

        D statives[454]);

infin.: *e-pa-še* 6:110a:2(Ec.) (but *e-pè-ši* 5:8:19(J)).

(v) Other forms with *e* for expected *i*, or *a* for expected

---

[453]*li-ra-hi-iṣ-šu* 3:76a:9,13; *li-hal-li-iq* 3:105:57;
li-te-ru-ni-in-ni 3:52:18; note also G 1s *lu-ù-uš-ku-un*
5:140:30.

[454]Unless *za-ak-ki* 3:110a:5 and *za-ak-ka!* 3:166:16' are
Ass. D's.

e, could also be Ass.; other suggestions were put forth above, 179ff., however.

(vi) It is possible that the 3fs prefix, which is normally *t*- in U, is due to Ass. influence; however, WS influence seems equally likely.

(vii) Two adverbs are Ass.: *ammaka*, *annaka*; see above, 273f., s.v.

(viii) The particle *mā*, indicating that direct speech follows, may be Ass. (*GAG* §121b).

Thus, for the most part, the U dialect exhibits Bab. (particularly MB) forms, although a number of genuine Assyrianisms do appear in the texts.

D. SYNTAX

1. *Word Order*[455]

a. Verbal Clauses.[456]

There is no fixed word order for any type of clause in these texts. In fact, the order of the various parts of speech in the clauses of many texts appears to be quite arbitrary. In quite a number of texts, e.g., the word order changes from one clause to the next, even in clauses with similar grammar otherwise, and similar content. Some examples are: *šumma urram šēram PN ana māti šanīti innabbit* (Conj.-Ap-S-A-V) "if in future PN flees to another country" 3:37a:5ff., but *šumma urram šēram PN₂ innabbit ana māti šanīti* (Conj.-Ap-S-V-A) ibid.:13ff.; *ša [dīn]a unammiš itti PN₁ u ahīšu itti [PN₂] 1 kakkara hurāṣi [ana] šarri inand[in] u 5 kakkara kas[pi] ana PN₁ ina[ndin] ša dīna una[mmiš]* (S-O-V-A; u-O-A-V-S) "Whoever starts legal action against PN₁ and his brother, against PN₂, will give the king 1 talent of gold; and whoever starts legal action will give PN₁ 5 talents of silver" 3:154:17ff.; *u ipṭuršu ištu aškāpūti u iškunšu ina amīlī imitti u amīl imitti ana pūhīšu ina aškāpūti iškun* (u-V(o)-A; u-V(o)-A; u-O-A-A-V) "And (the king) removed him from the leatherworkers, and placed him among the *imittu*-men,[457] and he placed an *imittu*-man among the

---

[455]Cf. *GAG* §§130,131.

[456]Clauses with the stative are treated in section b.

[457]On this word, written LÚ.ZAG.LU, cf. *CAD* I/J, 126b (*imittu* E).

leatherworkers as his substitute" 3:78:8ff.; *u PN GN iraṣṣap
ina kaspīšu ina erīšu ina gabbi mimmīšu u šarru uzakki GN
ina pilki* (*u*-S-O-V-A; *u*-S-V-O-A) "And PN will rebuild GN
with his own silver, copper, and property. And the king
freed GN of feudal service" 3:112b:8ff.; etc.[458]

In addition to changes of word order within individual
texts, there are some clauses which appear in several dif-
ferent texts, the order of their constituents differing in
some from that in others: e.g., *ištu ūmi annîm RN...ittadin
bīta eqla ša PN₁ ana PN₂* (Ap-S-V-O-A) "From this day RN...
gave the estate and land of PN₁ to PN₂" 3:160b:1ff., and
often; but *ištu ūmi annîm RN...bīta u eqlēti ša FN ina GN
ana PN ittadinšunu* (Ap-S-O-A-V(o)) "From this day RN...gave
the estate and lands of FN in GN to PN" 3:89b:1ff. Or com-
pare *amīlu mamman lā ilaqqēšu ištu qāti PN* (S-*lā*-V(o)-A)
"No one may take it from PN" 3:109b:13ff., and often, with
mamman ištu qātīšu lā ileqqēšunu (S-A-*lā*-V(o)) 3:109a:13f.

There are, however, a few patterns and tendencies that
emerge from the apparent arbitrariness. Thus, in the let-

---

[458]Other examples: 3:56:7ff. (Conj.-Ap-S-V-O;...; *u*-
Conj.-S-O-V); 3:114:13ff. (Conj.-Ap-S-V-A-A;...*u*-Conj.-S-A-
A-V); 3:134f.:8ff. (Ap-A-S-V(o); *u*-V(o)-A; S-O-A-V; *u*-S-*lā*-
V-A). A parade example is 3:102ff., a text concerning seve-
ral different royal grants to one individual; each grant is
treated in a separate paragraph. Note the following selec-
tions: *šanīta X šarru iddinšunu ana PN u PN 300 kaspa iddin
ana šarri* (Ap-O-S-V(o)-A;*u*-S-O-V-A) "moreover the king gave
X to PN, and PN gave to king 300 silver" *ll.*22f.; *šanīta Y
ana PN iddin šarru u PN 500 kaspa ana šarri iddinšu* (Ap-O-A-
V-S; *u*-S-O-A-V(o)) *ll.*29ff.; *šanīta Z ana PN mār PN₂ šarru
iddinšu u 300 kaspa ana šarri iddin* (Ap-O-A-S-V(o); *u*-O-A-V)
*ll.*32ff.

ters, the Akk. rule of placing the verb last in a clause is
carried out over three-fourths of the time. In one fairly
long letter, 5:87f. (36 lines), all of the clauses are verb-
final. However, that is exceptional; usually *most* of the
clauses are verb final, while one or two are not (e.g., *3:
5; *5:137; *5:141f.). Yet there is no pattern or predicta-
bility to the clauses in which the verb does not come at the
end.

In the legal texts, less than one-third of the clauses
are verb-final. In part, this is due to the great frequency
of certain formulas, in which the verb is almost never last,
e.g., the first two clauses of most texts: *ištu ūmi annîm
RN₁ mār RN₂ šar GN ittaši X u ittadinšu(nu)/iddinšu(nu)
(šarru) ana PN* (Ap-S-V-O; u-V(o)-(S-)A) "From this day, RN₁,
son of RN₂, king of GN, has taken X, and (the king) has
given it(them) to PN" (e.g., 3:48b:1ff., and p..). The pro-
hibitive clause with *lā ila/eqqe* (see above) is also very
common, and usually not verb-final. But even when these are
discounted, the number of verb-final clauses rises only to
about half. Some texts, and therefore, presumably, some
scribes, prefer them for the most part (e.g., 3:96f.; 3:91f.);
but in many other texts, there are no verb - final clauses,
or only one or two.

One rather peculiar tendency is that, in the legal
texts, the verb is usually final in an injunction or prohi-
bition (i.e., imper., prec., *lā* plus dur.), with the notable

exception of the ubiquitous *lā ila/eqqe* clauses mentioned
above. As examples, note: *mamma ana PN lā iraggum* (S-A-
lā-V) "no one may contest for PN" 3:70:10ff.; *bītu DN u kum-*
[*rūšu*](?) *ana PN lā utebbû* (S-A-*lā*-V) "The temple of DN and
its priests(?) may not rise up against PN" ibid.:21ff.[459]
In the letters, however, there are numerous commands in
which the verb is not final.[460]

The subject, when it occurs, usually precedes the verb,
whether the latter is clause-final or not.[461] The direct
object is also usually found before the verb.[462] Adverbs
and prepositional phrases, however, tend to follow the verb
(except for negatives, and adverbial expressions found in
clause-initial position, e.g., *urra šēra*, *šanīta*, *anumma*,
etc.).[463] Thus, the most common word order is (S-)(O-)V(-A)
(parentheses indicate that not all clauses have all of these
parts of speech). But this is merely the most frequent, not

---

[459]The only exceptions are *šanīta akil narkabti lā
uma'er eli PN u eli mārīšu* "Moreover the overseer of the
chariotry may have no power over PN or his sons" 3:81:31ff.,
and *u hazannu āli u akil eqlēti lā imallik elīšu* "And the
town mayor and the overseer of the lands may not command him"
3:135a:15f. (on *malāku* here, cf. *CAD* M/1, 158a).

[460]E.g., *3:19:22, 5:98:r11',14'; *5:137:8; 5:148:10,r9'.

[461]Over eighty per cent of the time.

[462]Actually, a simple count would show that the object
usually follows the verb, but that is because over a third
of the examples are the initial clauses of legal texts (*ištu
ūmi annîm RN...ittaši X*, where X is the object). Apart from
these, the object precedes the verb in about two-thirds of
the examples.

[463]In over three-fourths of the examples.

not the rule. Many other arrangements occur, some of them
often: e.g., (S-)(O-)(A-)V,[464] (S-)V-O(-A),[465] V-S(-O)(-A).[466]
Conversely, some patterns are found only infrequently, or not
at all. It is very unusual, e.g., for the subject, when it
follows the verb, to be at all separated from it.[467] It is
also unusual for an adverbial phrase (except a sentence-ini-
tial one) to precede a direct object; this means that if the
object follows the verb, an adverbial phrase, if there is
one, almost invariably will as well.

Since the word order in so many clauses, or rather, the
lack of a fixed word order, is not a feature of Akk. prose,
we must look elsewhere for its origin. It is unlikely that
the U scribes learned from Akk. poetry, where the word order
is much freer, and equally unlikely that the word order is
an invented feature (i.e., not a feature of any language
known by the scribes). The most tempting source, naturally,

---

[464]E.g., *šanīta PN zittašunu ana ekalli ušerreb* "More-
over PN will take their shares to the palace" 3:82:16f.

[465]E.g., *šumma urra šēra PN inammuš dīna itti ahīšu* "if
in future PN begins legal action against his brother" 3:81:
25ff.; here too belong the first clauses of most of the
legal texts (see n. 462, above).

[466]E.g., *u ittadin šarru tu[ppa] ana FN* "And the king
gave a tablet to FN" 3:94:r6'f. Usually, only a direct ob-
ject (V-S-O) or only an adverbial phrase (V-S-A) occurs:
e.g., *išši-mi RN 400 kaspa...* "RN took 400 silver..." 3:46:
7f.; *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka* "When/
Now then the king my lord has written to your servant" *3:5:
9f.

[467]But note: *u ittaši 20 kaspa PN m[u]tša* "and PN her
husband took 20 silver" *Sy*18:253f.:15f.

is Ugaritic, presumably the native language of most of these
scribes. And there is in fact a substantial correlation be-
tween the word order in the Ugaritic prose texts and that of
the Akk. material. Thus, in Ugaritic letters, the verb is
quite often at the end,[468] as in the U Akk. letters; and in
the few Ugaritic legal documents (the ones that are not
simply lists), the word order is usually (S-)V(-O)(-A),[469]
a common (but not the most common) pattern in the Akk.
counterparts. However, it is very likely that the style of
the Ugaritic documents was based on the Akk., and not vice
versa.[470] Thus, it is possible that the Ugaritic word order

---

[468]In over half the clauses that are both legible and
intelligible. As an example, note *UT* 1013(p.218):16ff.,
which I would vocalize and translate as follows:

(16)*li-yomi hanādi* (17)*ᶜalā*	"And if the Hittites come up,
wa-laʾiktu (18)*ᶜimmaki*	I will send (word) to you.
wa-him (19)*lā ᶜalā*	But (even) if they do not come,
wa-laʾaku-ma (20)*ʾilʾaku*	I will certainly send (word).
wa-ʾatti (21)*ʾummī*	So you, my mother, do not
ʾal tidhalī	be afraid;
(22)*wa-ʾap m-h-k-m* (23)	and do not place worry(?)
bi-libbiki ʾal (24)*taštī*	in your heart."

[469]In *UT* 1005, 1006, 1008, 1009 (pp. 216f.), this is the
case in all but two of the verbal clauses (which are V-S-A).
As an example, note *UT* 1008:

(1)*li-yomi hanādi* (2)*RN₁ binu*	"From this day RN₁ son of RN₂
RN₂ malku (3)*GN yatana* (4)*šadv*	king of GN gave the field of
PN₁ (6-10 difficult)	PN₁ ....
(11)*wa-yatana n-n* (12)*li PN₂*	And he gave them to PN₂ son
bini (13)*PN₃ wa-li* (14)	of PN₃ and to his sons
banīhu ᶜadi ᶜolami	forever.
(15)*šahra ᶜolamta* (16)*bunūšu*	In future, no one
bunūštma (17)*lā yiqqaḥ-n-n*	may take them from
bī-di (18)*PN₂ bini PN₃* (19)	PN₂ son of PN₃ or from
wa bī-di banīhu ᶜadi (20)*ᶜolami*	his sons forever
wa-ʾunuθθu(21)*ʾen bihu*	And there is no feudal ser-
	vice in it."

[470]Note, e.g., the great similarity in both content and
style between *UT* 1008 (above, n. 469), and the royal grants
in Akk. (e.g., 3:62f.; 3:118).

is also a reflection of that in the Akk., and that the latter was imported with the use of Akk. itself. That question is beyond the scope of this work, and the matter must remain open.[471]

b. Clauses with the Stative.[472]

In the letters and legal texts, there are 66 clauses containing the stative which are preserved well enough to determine their syntax. Of these, 32 have the stative of *ṣamātu*, 18 of *zakû*; both of these groups are therefore treated separately here.

The clauses exhibit the following word orders:

V: *ṣamātu*: 3:63b:12; *zakû*: 3:70:20; 3:162b:9; 3:166:16'; *5:142:30(with *lū*); other: 3:53b:13(*ḫašāḫu*); 5:8:8(*ra-šāpu*).

A-V: *zakû*: 5:15:r3',10'.

S-V: *ṣamātu*: 5:179:6(?).

S-A-V: *ṣamātu*: 3:52a:15f.; other: 3:84:24(*anāḫu*); 5:87:20ff.,22ff.(*ašābu*),25(*nadû*).

A-S-V: all *nadānu*: 3:142b:14f.; 3:161a:14ff.; 3:164b:13ff.

V-A: *ṣamātu*: 5:8f.:23; *zakû*: 6:48:16'; other: 3:68:

---

[471]Perhaps there is some influence on the word order from Hurrian, where the pattern S-O-V-A is quite common; examples may be found in F. Bush, "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1964), 257 (ex. 3), 259 (exx. 4-6), and *p*. Against this, perhaps, is the fact that, in the Amarna letters from Tushratta of Mittanni, the verb is usually at the end, often at the beginning of the sentence, but not in the middle; cf. H.-P. Adler, *AKTM* §62a, pp. 94f.; but note also §62b, p. 95.

[472]See the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

4ff.(nadānu); 5:8f.:22(qadāšu).

     A-V-A: 3:141:29(anāhu).

     S-V-A(-A): *šamātu*: 3:35a:7ff.; 3:86:r9'ff.; 3:96:18f.; 3:113:7ff.; 3:121:7ff.; 3:126:10ff.; 3:127f.:10ff.,25f.; 3:129:16f.; 3:130:7f.,9ff.; 3:138f.:8ff.,21ff.; 3:142a:9ff.; 3:143a:7ff.; 3:146:10ff.; 3:155a:8ff.; 3:160:17ff.; 5:8f.:13ff.; 5:9:10f., 5:263:10ff.; 6:29:17ff.; *šakû*: 3:70:17ff.; other: 3:114:26ff.(*šummuhu*).

     S-A-V-A(-A): *šamātu*: 3:89a:6f.,8f.,13f.(all logograms); 3:90b:12ff.

     A-S-V-A: *šamātu*: 3:36a:11ff.

     V-S: *šakû*:3:78:14; other: 5:98:12(?; *hitaddû*); 3:53:11f.(*hašāhu*).

     A-V-S: *šakû*: 3:32f.:4ff.; 3:68:16.

     V-S-A: *šakû*: 3:46:11f.; 3:54a:12; 3:78:14f.; 3:82:12f.,19; 6:52b:8; other: 3:68:7f.(*nakāru*),11f.(*nadānu*)

     A-V-S-A: *šakû*: 3:110a:5f.(?).

    The next paragraphs consist of a brief summary of these data.

    A nominal subject occurs with the stative as follows:

      with *šamātu*: S-V 30 V-S 0

       with *šakû*: S-V 1 V-S 10

          other: S-V 7 V-S 4.

Thus apart from *šakû*, the subject usually precedes the stative, as is the case with other verbal clauses.

    A pronominal subject is of course not usually expressed. In the two instances in which it is, the pronoun precedes the stative, as in classical Akk.:[473] *šumma urra šēra anāku mītāku* 3:76a:14; *šunu šarrū* 3:98:24.

_____

    [473]Cf. G. Buccellati, *JNES* 28, p. 6, and n. 23.

The relative order of the stative and adverbs or adverbial phrases (discounting sentence-initial adverbs like *šanīta*, etc.) is:

with *ṣamātu*: V-A 29 A-V 6[474]

with *zakû*: V-A 9 A-V 5

other: V-A 6 A-V 7.

Apart from clauses with *ṣamātu* and *zakû*, then, adverbs follow and precede the stative about equally. The position of the subject relative to the verb has no apparent influence on the position of the adverb. It was noted above that in other verbal clauses, adverbs more often follow the verb.

c. Nominal Clauses.

i. *with nominal predicate*

There are several clauses which consist of a predicate only (with or without an introductory conjunction), i.e., which have no subject expressed. Examples are: *nidnu šarri* "(It is) a royal grant" 3:65b:14; *u 140 kasapya ša irtēhi* "But (there were) 140 silver of mine which remained (owing)" *3:19:9f.; *šumma urram šēram mannum-mê ša šarrutta ina libbi GN eppaš* "if in future (there is) someone who exercises kingship in GN" *6:3:24ff.

Usually, however, there is a subject expressed. When it is a noun, or noun phrase, it normally precedes the pre-

---

[474]The sum of these is larger than the total number of clauses due to those in which adverbs or adverbial phrases come both before and after the verb.

dicate: e.g., *anumma X kaspu annû šîm(u)ya ša taltaqû-mi*
"Now then, this X silver is my payment which you have taken"
3:170b:7'f.; *u PN₁ u PN₂ [u PN₃] mār PN₄ urubānû [š]a nāba-*
ttšu[nu] "And PN₁, PN₂, and PN₃ son of PN₄ are the guarantors
against their fleeing" 3:37b:5ff.; *u PN mūdû šarri* "and PN
is a royal courtier" 3:84:20; 3:114:30f;[475] with a relative
clause as predicate: *kaspu annû ša muqqadim*[476] *ša irtēh*
"This silver is the pasture-tax which remained" 6:96b:6ff.(Ec.).
In one expression, an adverbial phrase (part of the predi-
cate) precedes the subject, for emphasis: *ana dāri dūri*
nidnu annû nadin "Forever this grant is given" 3:142b:14f.;
3:161a:13ff.; 3:164b:13ff.

There are several examples where the logical predicate
precedes the subject; these seem to place emphasis on the
predicate: *enūma zēr hurati ṣabûtuya* "Since/Now then *h.-*
seed is my desire" *6:12:7f.; *inanna 7 eleppētu ša nakrî*
ša illakanni "Now seven were the enemies' ships which came
to me" 5:87:27ff.[477] In one instance, the predicate--two
noun phrases each beginning with the determinative pronoun

---

[475]In both texts, and in 3:82:20f. and 3:85:15f. (see
below), what follows this clause is *X kaspa uppal* "he will
pay X silver." Nougayrol takes *PN mūdû šarri* as the subject
of *uppal*, and translates: "PN, compte du roi [X] (sicles
d')argent apportera." However, it seems more likely that
the texts are announcing both factors as new data, and
therefore that two clauses are involved.

[476]On the form and meaning of this word, see *CAD* M/1,
252a.

[477]Cf. also probably *4 meat kaspušunu* "Four hundred is
their silver (i.e., price)" 3:103:14.

ša--is split, with the subject standing between the two phrases: ša PN-ma gabba u ša mārīšu ana dāri dūri "It is to PN that everything (belongs), and to his children, forever" 3:102:16f. From the context, and the -ma, it is quite clear that ša PN is being emphasized.[478]

When the subject is a pronoun, it follows the predicate in two examples: ištēn amīlu nīnu "We are one man" *3:19:24; note the change in word order in the following clauses: (šumma...iqabbû) mā ul bēlni attā-mi šarru šanû bēlni "(if...they say:) you are not our lord; another king is our lord" 3:114:19f. The clauses in these examples exhibit the word order found in classical Akk. and in K.[479] In other instances, however, the subject precedes the predicate, contrary to normal Akk. usage: šū urra šēra mūdû šarri "In future he is a royal courtier" 3:82:20f.; 3:85:15f.;[480] šū zittašu "that is his share" 6:48b:7'; šīt bēltu bīti eli mārīši "She is the mistress of the estate, over her son" 3:86:23f.[481] Perhaps the order in these clauses is due to

[478]Compare a similar clause with normal word order: šanīta [panā]nam-ma(?) eqlu annû ša PN "Moreover previously(?) this field (belonged) to PN" 5:10:23f.

[479]Cf. G. Buccellati, JNES 27, 6ff. Von Soden (GAG § 126c,g), and E. Reiner (Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. T.A. Sebeok, Vol. 6 (Mouton: the Hague, 1970, 291f.), however, would both understand the pronoun as the predicate.

[480]See above, n. 475.

[481]Note also **EA47:10f., in which the predicate is marked with -ma: [u i]nanna anāku ana šarri šamši [bēlīy]a lū ardum (ÌR.MEŠ)-ma "Now, I am indeed the servant of the king, the Sun, my lord." On the MEŠ, see above, pp. 172ff.

Ugaritic influence; note, e.g., *at aḫ an a[ḫtk]* "You are my
brother; I am your sister" *UT* 3 *Aqht*:1:24, p. 249.

In one clause, a pronoun at the end resumes the subject:
u anumma ardūki ardū ša mārīya šunu "And now, your servants
are (also) my sons' servants"[482] *6:3:18f. This phenomenon
was also encountered in K, where it was suggested that it is
due to WS influence.[483]

ii. *adverbial predicate*

When the subject is a noun or noun phrase, it normally
precedes the adverbial predicate: e.g., *kasap ipṭerīšunu
ana yâši* "The silver for their ransom (will remain) with me"
*3:19:15f.; *u kaspu u eql(ēt)u ana PN* "then the silver and
field(s) (belong) to PN" 3:114:16,21; *X kaspi elīšu* "he will
owe X silver" 5:11:12, and often.

Conforming to this word order is the frequent greeting
lū šulmu ana muhhīka "Health be to you" e.g., 4:294:5, in
which the optative particle *lū* precedes the subject.[484]
However, in this period, this form of the greeting (i.e.,
subject-predicate) is with one exception attested only in
texts found at Ras Shamra,[485] although it is found there in

---

[482]Nougayrol interprets this sentence as a question,
and takes the first noun phrase as logical predicate: "Main-
tenant, est-ce que sont (aussi) tes serviteurs les serviteurs
de m[es] fils?" This rendering does not make this rather
obscure passage any clearer, however, and so a more straight-
forward translation seems preferable; so also A.F. Rainey,
IOS 3, 35.

[483]See above, pp. 96f.

[484]On *lū*, see below, pp. 321f.

[485]Cf. E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*

texts from several areas.[486] The exception is in a U text

in the Amarna archives, *EA*49:4ff. (see below). The normal

order in this period, in both native Akk. and WPA texts, is

ana (muhhi/mahar) X lū šulmu,[487] and in fact, as E. Salonen

has noted,[488] this is the order in texts found at Ugarit

whenever *ana (muhhi)* is followed by a noun: e.g., *ana muhhi*

bēlīya lū šulmu ana bītīka sekrētīka[489] *ana gabbi mimmû ša*

bēlīya danniš lū šulmu *3:5:5ff.[490] With one exception,

the order *lū šulmu ana muhhi X* occurs only, and always, when

X is a pronominal suffix (*-ka/-ki*), as in 4:294:5, quoted

above;[491] the exception is again *EA*49:4ff.: *lū šulmu ana*

---

in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen, St. Or. 38 (Helsinki:
Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967), 60, 63ff. This order
becomes very common in N/LB and NA letters; cf. ibid., 86ff.

    [486]Besides U, it occurs in K (e.g., 3:3:4, and often),
and in texts from Amurru (e.g., *PRU* 4:214:4), from Siyannu
(e.g., *Ug.* 5:126:4), from Alashiya (*Ug.* 5:85:5), and probably
from Khatti (e.g., *PRU* 3:15:4, the origin of which is not
absolutely certain).

    [487]For MB texts found in Mesopotamia, see Salonen, op.
cit. (above, n. 485), 60; note also the Amarna letters from
Babylonia, *EA*2-4,6-12; for WPA, note *EA*1,5(Egypt); *EA*33,35-
40(Alashiya); *EA*41(Boghazkoy); also for Boghazkoy, see Labat,
AkkBo, 214 (s.v. *šulmu*); for Alalakh (MB), note *AT* 109:4f.;
115:8f.

    [488]Op. cit. (above, n. 485), 73.

    [489]On this reading of MÍ.UŠ(NIDLAM₂), cf. *AHw*, 1036a
(*sekretu* 3), and Labat, *MEA*, no. 554, p. 229.

    [490]Cf. also 3:4:5ff.; 5:81:3'ff.; 5:87:6ff.; 5:97f.:5ff.;
*5:137:14ff.; 6:5:5.

    [491]Also *3:19:r; 5:139:4; *5:141:4; 5:147:4; *6:12a:4.
Without *lū*, note ⌈anumma(?) i⌉ttu šulmu "Now then(?) I am
well(?)" 5:148:13. This text has *ittu* rather than *itti*
also in *ll.*14,r7'. In the same text, Nougayrol restores

---

muḫḫi šarri šamši bēltya bīt[āttē]u.[492] This example aside,

the contrast in word order in the other texts is difficult

to explain.[493]

The other clause type with the order predicate-subject

is *ašrānu itt[u*[494] *umm]īya mīnum-mê šulmānu* "There with my

mother is there all well-being?" 5:148:r7'f.[495] It was

noted above (p. 98, n.251), that this formula is probably

a question, and that that explains the reversal in the word

order.

In one example, the subject is a pronoun, and follows

the predicate adverb: ⌜*u*⌝ [*k*]*īšū-ma*[496] *šunū-ma* "and they

(will be treated) similarly" 5:10:23

---

a-na m[uḫ-ḫi-ki šu]l-mu. However, the copy shows that there
is enough room for *a-na m[uḫ-ḫi* AMA-*ia lu-ú šu]l-mu*, which
would comform to the rule.

[492]This passage was apparently not noticed by Salonen,
since he did not list *lū šulmu ana...* as a variant attested
in the Amarna texts; cf. op. cit. (above, note 485), 63ff.

[493]This contrast of word orders also appears in Ugari-
tic letters; note: *yšlm . lk* "May it be well with you" *UT*
54:4, p. 175; 1015:4, p. 219; 2059:4, p. 17*; but *l . umy .
yšlm* "May it be well with my mother" *UT* 117:6f., p. 189;
1013:5f., p. 218. Again, it seems just as likely that the
Akk. order has influenced the Ugaritic as vice versa.

[494]On *ittu* see n. 491, above.

[495]Cf. also *5:137:19: [*u*](?) *ak-kāši*(?) *ašrān[u
mī]num-mê šulmāni*; on *ak-kāši* "with (to) you" (for Nougay-
rol's *ag-ga-ya*), see above, p. 191, n. 95.

[495]On *kīšū-ma*, see above, p. 277, s.v.

iii. *clauses with* yānu

Clauses which have as predicate the particle of non-existence yānu present a special case, for although the word is not a verb, it functions as one.[496] In all but four cases, the noun which it negates is *pilku* or *ilku* "feudal service." The following represent all the clause types.

       (a) *u pilku* yānu 3:159a:18; cf. 3:142a:7.

       (b) *u pilku* yānu *ina eqli annî* 3:160a:25; cf. 3:116:
            r9'f.; 3:117:r10f.; 3:118:26f.; 3:122:18f.;
            3:126:25f.; 3:136:22; 3:152:r4'; 6:45:26f.

       (c) *u pilka* yānu 3:134:26; cf. 3:129:17.

       (d) *u pilka* yānu *ina eqli annî ša GN* 3:128:17; cf.
            ibid.:30; 3:123:19f.; 3:125:r3'f.

       (e) *u ina bîti eqli ša GN pilku* yānu 6:33:21f.

       (f) *annaka asû* yānu EA49:24f.

       (g) *u pilku ina eqli šuwāti* yānu 3:146a:13.

       (h) *u pilka i⌈na eqli annî⌉* yānu 3:156:17f.

       (i) *kaspu unūtu gabbu mimmû ša ummi PN eltya* yānu
            3:82:23ff.

       (j) yānu *rabû* yānu *ṣehru* ⌈*ina birîšunu*⌉ 5:173:5; cf.
            *5:146:14ff.

Thus, in all but two examples, the noun (phrase) precedes yānu; in the two clauses in (*j*), however, the "subject" follows. In those examples where *(p)ilku* is apparently the object of yānu (*c,d,h*), no subject is expressed.

When there is an adverb phrase dependent on yānu, it follows the particle 15 times (*b,d,j*), but precedes it only

---

    [496]Cf. *GAG* §111b. See also below, pp. 320f.

five times (*e-i*).

Thus, the word order tends overwhelmingly to be S/O-*yānu*(-A), and in this regard, clauses with *yānu* parallel true verbal clauses.

2. *Modification of the Noun*

a. By an Adjective.

There are more adjectives attested in U than in K, but proportionately they probably occur no more frequently. Examples of those attested in the letters and legal texts are:

> *annû* "this" p.;[497] *damqu* "good, well made" 5:98:r9', 10',13'; *eššu* "new" 3:52b:3; *rabû* "large, elder" 5: 173:5; *rēhu* "remaining" 3:57:17; *ṣehru* "small, younger" 5:173:5; *šanû* "(an)other" p.(see below); *zakû* "pure, free (of claims)" 3:111:11.

Adjectives are naturally more frequent in economic texts, since these often involve descriptions of the entries. Very often, the adjectives there are written logographically (e.g., 3 TÚG.MEŠ GAL 6 TÚG.MEŠ TUR.MEŠ "3 large garments, 6 small garments" 6:99c:1f.); but syllabic spellings also occur (e.g., *re-qu* "empty" 6:120a:5,7[498]).

---

[497]See above, p. 204.

[498]The form *(la) ša/šal-li-ma* (5:189f.:p.), following ÌR(.MEŠ), is obscure. It is presumably an adjective ("complete"?), but the acc. case and intermittent double -*ll*- are puzzling. If the -*l*- is in fact single, the form would be Ugaritic (**šalima*), since in Akk. the *i* would be syncopated. But double writings of single consonants are rare in U; see above, 175f.

Agreement is discussed below in section 3; for adjectives, see pp. 314f.

In all but one instance, adjectives follow the noun. The exception is: *ša-nu pilku yānu* "There is no other feudal service" 3:126:25f; cf. *šarru ša-nu bēlni* "Another king is our lord" 3:114:20.

Adjectives modifying nouns in the bound form always follow the nomen rectum, as in *kunuk šarri* GAL-*bu* "the great royal seal" 3:49:25. Those modifying unbound nomina regentia (i.e., nouns followed by the gen. with *ša*) may occur either before or after the gen. (examples below, b ii). Adjectives always precede attributive relative clauses (examples below, c).

b. By a Noun in the Genitive.

i.   As in K,[499] the most common means of expressing a genitive relationship is the use of the bound form. Unlike K, however, the bound form remains more prevalent than the use of *ša* even when high-frequency nouns, which always or nearly always occur in the bound form when nomina regentia (e.g., *šarru, māru, (ana) muhhi*, etc.), are discounted. A few examples will suffice (more are cited above, pp. 219ff.): *bēltu bīti* "the mistress of the estate" 3:86:23; *taptētu eqlēt FN* "The new land of FN's fields" 3:139:19; *kubbudāti šarri* "honorific gifts for the king" 3:99a:8. In two instances, the particle -*ma* breaks up the construct chain:[500]

_____

[499]See above, pp. 99f.

[500]In Ugaritic, enclitic *m* may appear on the bound form;

piłka-ma mur'ū[501] *rābiṣi* "the service of the prefect's m.-officials" 3:146:14; *ina qāti(m)-ma amīlī GN* "in the hands of the men of GN" 3:98:7',11'. Otherwise, the nomen rectum always follows the bound form immediately.[502]

Rarely, a single bound form may govern more than one nomen rectum: e.g., *šīm bīti eqli* "the price of the house (and) field" 3:89b:7; *ištu qāti akil narkabti u hazanni* "From (the hand of) the overseer of the chariotry and the mayor" 3:84:22. However, *ša* is also used in such cases (see below, ii). I can find no certain instances in which a single nomen rectum is governed by more than one bound

---

cf. *UT* §8.16, p. 56. Note that in other examples, *ša* is used when *-ma* occurs on the nomen regens: e.g., *piłka-ma ša namūti* 3:116:r10'; cf. 6:33:22f.

[501]*mur'ū*, also in the bound form (pl.), is in the wrong case; gen. *mur'ī* is expected.

[502]In 3:93b:11, Nougayrol takes *a-na UD.MEŠ TE TIL.LA.MEŠ PN* as *ana ūmī balāṭ(i) gamrūti PN*, i.e., "pour tous les jours de la vie de PN." If this were correct, it would mean that an adjective (*gamrūti*) stood between the bound form and its genitive. However, *CAD B*, 51 (*balāṭu* 2 b) suggests *ana UD.MEŠ-te TIL.LA.MEŠ PN* (for *ana ūmāte(?) balāṭ PN*) "during the lifetime of PN." The usual logogram in Akk. for *balāṭu* is TI(.LA); however, TIL(.LA) occurs *p.* in the Amarna letters (cf. *EA* II, 1388). Still, there is a problem in creating a plural of *ūmu* in *-t-*, which would be attested in U only here and in the other examples of this expression. They are: *i-na UD-mi-ti ba-la-ṭi-šu* 3:92:13; *i-na UD.1.KAM.MEŠ-ti TIL.LA-šu* 3:132:23. The first example is particularly difficult because of the plural(?) *ūmīti(?)*; perhaps in this case, Nougayrol's interpretation should be retained, in which TI is the logogram for the following *balāṭīšu*. For a parallel example, i.e., one in which a logogram is glossed by a syllabic spelling without a preceding "Glossenkeil," note, e.g., *šum-ma...a-na-ku BA.UG$_7$ mi-ta-ku* "if...I die" 3:76a:4f.

form (i.e. *X u Y Z "the X and Y of Z").[503] ša is used in
such cases (see below, ii).

ii.   The use of ša for the genitive relationship is not
rare, but it is not nearly as common as the simple bound
form. There are, however, a few conditions under which the
use of ša seems preferred. One occurs when the nomen regens
is modified by an adjective: note, e.g., bītu eššu ša PN
"PN's new house" 3:52b:3; 1 qašta damiqta ša GN "one good
bow from GN" 5:98:rl0',13'. Yet in some instances, the
bound form is used, and the adjective comes after the gen.:
nidnūti[504] šarri annûti "these royal grants" 3:148a:16.[505]
And in others, the adjective follows the gen. even though
ša is used: nadāna ša šarri annâ "this royal gift" 3:118:
21f. ša is also employed when the gen. modifies a string
of nouns:[506] e.g., bītu eqlu immerātu alpu maršītu ša PN
"PN's house, field, sheep, oxen, and (other) property" 3:
102:4; [tu]ppa u kunukka ša šarri "the royal tablet and seal"
3:56:2. It may also be used when more than one gen. modifies

---

    [503]In 5:8f.:19f., read probably aššum epēši u [X] bīt
kunahi, where X is probably another infinitive (e.g., raṣāpu;
see below, p. 360, and n. 684). Since the nomen regens of
the object is a logogram (É), it cannot be determined whether
the infinitives are in construct to a following genitive,
(the case-ending would be normal in U; see above, 220f.), or
whether they take bīt kunahi as a direct object (acc.). In
favor of the former alternative is ana ša'āli šulmi in 4:294:9f.

    [504]SUM<.MEŠ>.

    [505]Cf. also 3:49:26, cited above in section a.

    [506]Cf. GAG §138b.

a nomen regens: *eqlu ša PN₁ u ša PN₂ u ša PN₃ u ša PN₄* 3:

159:6ff. Finally, there is a tendency for *ša* to be used

when the nomen regens is a non-Akk. word: e.g., *unuššu*[507]

ša bīti "the feudal service of the estate" 3:53b:20 (but also

unušša bītāti 3:63a:17); *ma(ʾ)šara*[508] *ša GN* "the tithe of

GN" 3:93b:7; *marṣiʾŧ*[509] *ša šatrana* "the m.'s of š" 3:130:4,7,

10f., 15f.[510]

In the only text in which *qātāti ṣabātu* "to guarantee"[511]

occurs, the idiom was apparently so strongly felt to be a

unit that the gen. was placed after the verb; therefore, *ša*

has to be used: *PN₁...u PN₂...qātatti iṣṣabat ša PN₃* "PN₁

...and PN₂...guaranteed PN₃" 3:37a:1ff.; cf. 9ff.

Apart from these observations, there appear to be no

other determining factors governing the choice of either the

bound form or *ša*. Other examples of the latter are: *šīmti*

---

[507]This word may be an Akk. *puruss* type (cf. Nougayrol's
comments, *PRU* 3, 227). However, since it is not attested
outside these texts, but does occur in Ugaritic (*unθ*, e.g.,
UT 1006:16,19; 1008:20; 1009:18), it is probably foreign in
Akk.

[508]This is not attested in Ugaritic, although the root
ᶜšr "ten" is; cf *UT* §7.18, p. 45, and §7.55, p. 49.

[509]Cf. Ugaritic *mrzᶜy*, *UT* §2313, p. 483.

[510]Note also 3:41a:3(*huburtanūru*; Ugaritic *hbrtnr UT*
§925, p. 400); 3:37b:7(*urubānu*; Ugaritic *ᶜrbnm UT* §1915, p.
461); 6:33:23(*maryannūti*); 3:134:26([*k*]*akkaru*]; cf. perhaps
Ugaritic *kkrdn UT* 169:r10); probably also the word *pilku*, al-
though it is not attested in Ugaritic (e.g., 3:67b:11; 3:77b:
8; but note the bound form 3:89:18f.); perhaps also *bītu* :
KU-bu-ri ša PN 3:51b:8, unless this is *qubūru* "grave."

[511]Cf. *CAD* Ṣ, 32a, where it is noted that the proper
expression is *qātāti leqû*; see *CAD* L, 145b.

ša mārīšu "the final will for his sons" 3:56:4, but *šīmti*[512]

bītīšu 5:10:3; *ana ša'āli šulmi ša šarri* "to inquire after

the king's well-being" 4:294:9f.; *kasap hubullī ša bīti* "the

silver of the estate's debts" 3:60b:16f.

iii.   The construction *X-šu ša Y* for "the X of Y" occurs

much more frequently in U than in K.[513]   However, it is at-

tested only in the legal texts.   There, it is most often

found in the first clause of the text, in which the object(s)

of the transaction is(are) first mentioned.   Also, it is

much more common in royal grant texts than other types of

transactions, and, finally, more common in texts from the

reign of Niqmaddu II than in texts of later kings' reigns.

As an example, note *ištu ūmi annîm RN...ittaši bītšu eqelšu*

gabba mimmīšu ša PN "From this day RN...took the estate,

field, all the property of PN" 3:48:1ff.; cf. 3:53:1ff.; 3:

65:1ff., and often.[514]   The construction is also common

elsewhere, however: e.g., *ištu ahhīšu ša PN* "from PN's

brothers" 3:102:14.   As the examples show, the nomen rectum

is usually a person (especially a PN); however, there are

exceptions: e.g., *še'šu šikaršu ša : ma'šarīša* "the grain

and beer of its tithe" 3:147a:10f.   The pronominal suffix is

---

[512]On this form, see above, p. 219, n. 198.

[513]Above, pp. 101f., q.v., for a discussion on the
origin of the construction.

[514]All the references given are from the reign of Niq-
maddu II.   The construction is not attested in the few texts
from Arhalbu's reign.   For Niqmepa, note, e.g., 3:101:1ff.;
for Ammistamru II, 3:123:6,11.

almost always -*šu*, but that is because it agrees in number and gender with the genitive, which is usually ms.[515] Otherwise, note: *eqlēti gabba mi[mm]tšina ša mārat PN₁ u ša mārat PN₂* "the fields, all the property of PN₁'s daughter and PN₂'s daughter" 5:13:4f.[516]

This construction seems to be completely interchangeable with that using only *ša*. Thus, e.g., the -*šina* of the last example is not necessary; nor is -*šu* in *šumma ahūšu ū šumma māršu ša PN* "whether PN's brother or son" 3:114'27. Note also: *ana kallūtišu ša PN* "in marriage to PN" 3:60b:9, but *ana kallūti ša PN* in *l.*13. In some cases, all three types of construction are equivalent: e.g., *ištu ūmi annîm RN...iddin bītšu ša PN₁ u 2 bītātu ša PN₂ eqelšu ša PN₃ eqelšu ša PN₄ eqel šarri ina GN₁ eqel PN₅ ina GN₂...RN...ittadinšu[nu]* "From this day RN...has given PN₁'s estate. And RN...has given 2 estates of PN₂, the field of PN₃, the field of PN₄, the royal field in GN₁, the field of PN₅ in GN₂" 3:47a:1ff. Also compare the following: *pilka bītšu uppal* "will be responsible for the feudal service of his estate" 3:89:18f., but *pilka ša bīti uppal* 3:67b:11, and *pilkašu ša eqli šuwāti*

---

[515]There are a few possible exceptions to this; note: *pilkašu ša* LÚ.MEŠDAM.GÀR-*ut-ti* 6:32a:9; perhaps "traders" is the meaning of the last word, but it is more likely that it is an abstract noun, "occupation of trader" (cf. *AHw*, 1315b). Again, in *pilkašu ša* LÚŠÀ.TAM.MEŠ, 3:132:30, the logogram is more likely for *šatammūtu* "office of steward" (cf. *AHw*, 1199b), than *šatammū* "stewards" (on MEŠ in U, see above, pp. 172ff.).

[516]Note perhaps also *panūšunu ša* ["the faces of ..." ***EA*46:10'.

PN ul uppal 3:96:15ff.

iv.   The fourth means of expressing a genitive relationship which occurs in K, namely *ša X Y-šu* "the Y of X" (see above, 102ff.), is not attested in U.

c. By a Relative Clause.

    Relative clauses are considered in detail below, pp. 332ff. Here it is only to be noted that most of them are adjectival.[517] If the noun is also modified by an adjective or nomen rectum, the relative clause comes last: e.g., *bīta šanâ ša rābiṣu ittadinšu* "Another house which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f.; *2 bītāt PN₁ ša [ina] panānu ana PN₂* "two estates of PN₁ which formerly belonged to PN₂" 3:103:13. No examples of the *bīt imqutu* or *bīt īpušu* constructions occur in U.[518]

d. By a Noun in Apposition.[519]

    As in K, a few examples will illustrate this means of modification: *PN 2000 kaspa šīm bīti eqli ana šarri ittadinšu* "PN gave the king 2000 silver, the price of the house and field" 3:89b:6f.; *šībūtu ša GN PN₁...PN₂...u akil lim amīlu annûtu...līrubū* "May the witnesses of GN, PN₁...PN₂...and

---

    [517]Cf. *GAG* §165e.

    [518]Unless one considers [*mannu*]*m-mê...inakkir* "anyone who(whoever)...disputes" in 3:108:19f. to be an example (vs., e.g., *mannum-mê...ša izziz* "anyone...who disputes" *Sy*18:249: 16f.); see above, p. 205f., n. 143.

    [519]*GAG* §134.

the overseer-of-a-thousand--these men--enter" *5:142:21ff.

There are also many instances of apposition to a PN, in

which an individual's profession, or some characteristic,

is noted: e.g., *PN tupšarru* "PN the scribe" 3:68:7. Occa-

sionally, the appositive noun is separated from the noun it

modifies, e.g., by a verb: *20 kaspa uppal mūdâtšu* "He will

pay 20 silver (as) his *mūdû*-tax" 3:162b:7. Finally, note

the use of an appositive accusative to express intent in 6:

27:5'ff., quoted below, p. 364.

3. *Agreement*

As in K, there are very few instances of lack of con-

cord in the letters. The legal documents, on the other

hand, exhibit numerous examples. Again, as in K, many of

these are due to the formulaic nature of such texts.

Lack of agreement between subject and verb is not un-

common. Normally, a pl. subject takes a pl. verb: e.g.,

FN u PN...ittašûni...u itta[di]nûšunu...PN u FN...uppalū

"FN and PN....took...and gave...PN and FN will be responsible

for..." 3:61:4ff.; *ša iltarqû amīlū GN* "which the men of GN

stole" *5:141:7ff. But there are many exceptions:[520]

hazannu āli u akil eqlēti lā imallik elîšu "The town mayor

and the overseer of the fields may have no power over him"

_____

[520]Unless context demands a pl., words with MEŠ or HI.A
as determinative are treated as sg. if the verb is sg.; cf.
above, pp. 172ff. Of course, certainty is often impossible
in such cases. In Syl8:252:21f., *šumma PN ū mārūšu itūr*
"if PN or his sons return," the verb agrees with the first
of the alternative subjects.

3:135a:15f.; *PN₁...u PN₂...qātatti iṣṣabat ša PN₃* "PN₁...and

PN₂...guaranteed PN₃" 3:37a:1ff. (cf. *ll.*9ff.: *PN₄...qātatti*

iṣṣabat ša PN₅); (*šumma...*) *aḫḫū ša PN itūr ana PN* "if PN's

brothers turn against him" 3:33a:11f. (cf. *šumma PN itūr* in

*ll.*14f.);[521] *mārū PN uzakkīšu* "the sons of PN freed him (PN₂)"

3:154:14f.; note also with the stative: *zaki PN zaki mārūšu*

"PN is free; his sons are free" 3:78:14;[522] prec.: *ilānu*

šumšu liḫalliq "May the gods destroy his name" 3:105:56f.;

etc.[523] Finally, *bašû* is always ms, regardless of its sub-

ject:[524] *šumma elepp[ētu] ša nakrī šanāt[u]*[525] *ibaššī* "if

the enemies' ships are (again) present" 5:88:32ff.

It was noted above (p. 225), that nouns preceded by

numerals are treated as sg. in U; thus, their predicates

are sg.: e.g., *4 eqlu*[MEŠ] *ṣamit* "the 4 fields are transferred"

---

[521]But note pl. *itūrūni* 3:114:14; 3:170b:12'.

[522]The stative *ṣami/at* is nearly always sg. even when the subject is pl.: e.g., 3:126:11ff.; but *ṣamatū* 3:93b:13.

[523]With subject *eleppētu*, the verbs *illaka!* and *illa-kanni* in 5:87:13,29 could be f. pl.; but it is more likely that they are m. sg. See above, pp. 231f. In 5:263b:3ff., DUMU-*ru PN ipšur eqlēttšunu qadu eqli ša ilteqe* "The son(s) of PN released his/their field along with the field he/they had taken," DUMU-*ru* could indicate the pl. However, we would expect DUMU.MEŠ for the pl. (and note LUGAL-*ru* for *šarru*, sg., 6:44f.:18,28,20); it is thus possible that one son is meant, and that we should emend to *eqlēttšu<<nu>>*. In *5:137:6ff., the sense requires that the sg. verb of the relative clause go with the pl. *amīlī*: *anumma ištēn amīla ina libbi amīlī ša ašrānu itt[īka w]ašib leqe* "Take one man from among the men who are living there with you."

[524]Cf. GAG §132g.

[525]Reading *ša-na-⌈tù!⌉*; this seems preferable to creat-ing a new word *šanā'iš* "again," as P.-R. Berger does in *UF* 1, 220 (accepted by von Soden in *AHw*, 1161a).

5:263a:10f.

There are very few cases of a sg. subject with a pl. verb: note *umallûni* "he will pay" 3:37a:16, influenced by the correctly pl. (and identical) form in *l*.8;[526] perhaps also *šumma* [mann]*um-ma ušamraṣūšunûti* "if someone(?) gives them trouble" *6:3:27; but the break makes the subject uncertain.[527]

In one instance, a f. pl. noun has a m. pl. predicate: *gabbu* ⌈*eleppētūya*⌉ *ina GN ašbū* "All my ships are stationed in GN" 5:87:22ff. Perhaps the f. pl. of verbs was the same as the m. p. (i.e., both -*ū* in U, as was suggested for K (above, p. 54). It is also possible, however, that this form was influenced by *ašbū* (with m. p. subject) in *l*.22. In 3:55:17, the 3fs verb is *uṣṣi*, whereas elsewhere in this text the 3fs always has a *t*- prefix (*ll*.19,20,21,22,25).[528] Whether *uṣṣi* is thus a case of lack of agreement (m. for f.), or both prefixes were acceptable to this scribe, cannot be determined.[529]

---

[526]Cf. *PRU* 3, 37, n. 1.

[527]Perhaps the form is a subjunctive, after *šumma*; cf. 4:54:12f. in K, discussed above, 62f. The extreme rarity of the subjunctive in U (above, p. 242f.) makes this unlikely, however.

[528]And elsewhere in U, except for text 3:110a; see 228f.

[529]Note also *ki-ma* ᴰUTU *za-ak-ki* 3:110a:5. The verbal adjective of *zakû* here (the extra *k* is peculiar; Ass. D?) may either be in the predicative state, i.e., *zak(k)i*, or the normal unbound state, i.e., *zak(k)î*. The former is more likely due to the lack of full writing of the final vowel (but cf., e.g., LUGAL *ša-nu* "another king" 3:114:20). In either case,

Changes in person occur sporadically, especially in the letters, where there is a tendency to lapse, from the formality of addressing a superior in the third person, into the second person. An example is: *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka* "Since the king my lord (the addressee) has written to your servant" *3:5:9f.

Adjectives nearly always agree with the nouns they modify: e.g., *nidnu annû* "this grant" 3:117:rll; *ina eqlēti : harṣāti* "in plowed(?) fields" 3:95:11; *ana māti šanīti* "to another country" 3:37a:6,14; etc. There are a few mistakes, however:[530] e.g., wrong case: *eqla*MEŠ *qallu* (acc.) "the small(?)[531] field" 3:112a:5;[532] wrong gender: *tuppāti sarrūti* "false tablets" 3:97:17f.[533] There was also apparently some confusion as to the gender of a small number of words in the plural: SUM.MEŠ-*ti*[534] *an-na-ti* "these grants" 3:145:27, but SUM.MEŠ-*ti an-nu-ti* in *l*.31 (also 3:116:rl0'); A.ŠÀ.

---

the problem is that the sun-god is normally treated as f. in U, not m. as here; note, in the predicate state: *ki-ma* [DUTU] * za-ka-at* 3:107b:5f.; in the normal state: *ki-ma* DUTU *za-ki-ti* 3:57:14; cf. 3:111:10.

[530]Note that nouns with MEŠ or HI.A, which have sg. adjectives, are assumed to be sg.; see above, pp. 172ff. The assumption may be incorrect at times, adding to the number of errors.

[531]Cf. *AHw*, 894b (*qallu* 2).

[532]In (acc.) *tuppu annâm* "this tablet" 3:105:56, it is the noun that is in the wrong case.

[533]On *ki-ma* DUTU *za-ak-ki* 3:110a:5, see n. 529, above.

[534]No pl. forms of *nidnu* are listed in *AHw*, 786b.

MEŠ[535] an-na-t[i] "these fields" 3:126:26 (cf. A.ŠÀ.HI.A :

ra-ba-ti 5:114; A.ŠÀ.MEŠ ku-ub-sà-ti, ki-na-ti 3:48a:10,16;

and 3:95:11 quoted above), but A.ŠÀ.HI.A an-nu-(ú-)ti 3:123:

19; 3:136:23; 6:45:22,27.

Pronouns are consistently the same gender as the nouns

to which they refer, with three exceptions: 3:110a, which

always has -šu for the 3fs (ll.8,11,17); the same text has

m. verbs for the 3fs (ll.7,13) contrary to normal U usage;[536]

3:64:4f.: FN ilteqēša "FN took it(m.)," in which subject

and object have been reversed, presumably due to Hurrian in-

fluence;[537] and in the salutation of letter *6:2f., which is

addressed to a woman, where the 2ms suffix occurs instead of

the f. (ll.6f.), undoubtedly because of the formulaic nature

of the clause.[538]

Otherwise, there is a pronounced tendency for sg. pro-

nominal suffixes to replace pl. forms. The latter do occur:

e.g., RN...ittaši X eqla...u Y eqla...u Z eqla...[u i]ddin-

---

[535] eqlu is normally f. in the pl., but occasionally m.
in Nuzi; cf. CAD E, 249b (eqlu, heading).

[536] See above, 228f.

[537] In Hurrian's ergative system, when both a subject
and object (in English or Akk. terms) are expressed, the
"subject" appears in the verb as an agentive suffix; cf. F.
Bush, "Hurrian," 206ff. The Hurrian influence in 3:64:4f.
was first suggested by Gordon, in RA 50, 129. This feature
occurs sporadically in Nuzi; cf. Gordon, OrNS 7, 221; Wil-
helm, Hurro-Akkadischen, 61ff., and the literature cited
there. See also A.D. Kilmer, JAOS 94 (1974), p. 179.

[538] The woman is even called bēltya in l.7. Cf. PRU 6,
2, n. 5.

šunu...amīlu mamman lā ilaqqēšunu... "RN...took X field... and Y field...and Z field (etc.), and gave them...No one may take them..." 3:122f.:2ff.; cf. 3:129a; 3:133; 3:135f.; etc. The sg. forms, however, occur almost as often as the pl. when the latter are expected:[539] e.g., *RN...ittaši X eqla ...u Y eqla...u ittadinšu...mannum-mê lā ilaqqēšu* 3:75b:2ff.; cf. 3:112a: 3:126; 3:142b; etc. In not a few texts, both *-šu* and *-šunu* refer to the same object (pl.) or group of objects: e.g., *RN...ittaši bīt PN₁ u bīta eššā...u gabba eqlēti ša PN₁ u iddinšu ana PN₂ mārtšu...ištēnšu PN₁ abūšū-ma iddinšunu u šanâm RN šarru iddinšu* RN...took the house of PN₁ and the new house and all the fields of PN₁ and gave it to PN₂ his son...First it was PN₁ his father who gave them and secondly RN the king gave it" 3:96f.:2ff.; *u PN X...u Y ittašīšu u iddinšunu* "And PN took (it) X...and Y and gave them" 3:85:7ff.; cf. also 3:53a:22ff.; 3:108f. (*iddinšu l.8,* but *ileqqēšunu l.14*); 3:148f. (*ittadinšunu l.7,* but *ilaq-qēšu l.10*). Note also *šanīta 2 bītāt PN₁...inanna šarru ana PN₂ iddinšu 400 kaspušunu* "Moreover the 2 houses of PN₁... the king has now given to PN₂; their price (lit.: silver) is 400" 3:103:13f., but *šanīta 2 bītāt PN₃ iddinšunu ana PN₃* in *l.22.*

---

[539]In many cases, the pronoun may refer to a catch-all word at the end of a series, and so be correctly sg.: e. g.; *RN...ittaši bītšu eqel/eqlēti*[HI.A]*šu gabba mimmīšu ša PN nayyāli u iddinšu...* "RN...took the house, the field(s), (i.e.,) everything of PN the defaulter, and gave it..." 3: 60:21ff.; cf. 3:53b; and often.

Nougayrol misunderstood a number of points that bear on the subject of concord in U, namely, that adjectives nearly always agree with their nouns (see above), that nouns after numbers are sg. (see p. 225), and that both MEŠ and HI.A may or may not indicate plurality (see pp. 172ff.). The result is that a great many texts in his transliterations exhibit lack of agreement, when there is none; i.e., the U texts are actually much more consistent in this regard than his transliterations show. A good example is 6:44f. In $l.5$, he has: 6 $ik\hat{u}$ $[eql\hat{a}t]i^H,$[540] but in $l.10$, $eq[la]^H$ $an[-na-]a$, referring to the same grant; in $l.16$ (a different grant), 3 $ik\hat{u}$ $e[ql]\hat{a}ti$, but $it-ta-din-\check{s}u$ referring to it in $l.18$; in $ll.22,27$, there is $eqli^H$ $an-nu-(\hat{u}-)ti$. The text probably has no lack of agreement at all (on the m. pl. of $eqlu$, see above). Lines 4ff. should be read as follows: $PN_1...$ $ip-ta-\underline{t}ar$ $6(?)$ $ik\hat{a}$(GÁN) $[eql]i([A.\check{S}]A.HI.A)$ $\check{s}a$ PN_2 $\check{s}a$ ina $eqel/eql\hat{i}$(A.ŠÀ.HI.A) $n[i(?)-i]g$-$\ulcorner gi_5 \urcorner$-$e\underline{t}$[541]$...$ $\ulcorner LÚ \urcorner$ $ma-[am-$ $m]a-an$ $la-a$ $i-la-qe$ $eqla($A.$\ulcorner$ŠÀ$\urcorner$.HI.A$)$ $a[n-na]-a$ $i\check{s}-tu$ $qa-ti$ PN_1 "$PN_1...$redeemed 6 $ik\hat{u}$'s of the field of PN_2 which is in the field(s) of the 'cleft'(?)...No one may take this field from PN_1"; $ll.14ff.$: $\check{s}a-ni-ta_5$ RN...$it-ta-\check{s}i$ 3 $ik\hat{a}$(GÁN) $eqli($A.$\ulcorner$ŠÀ.HI$\urcorner$.A$)$ $\check{s}a$ PN_3 $\hat{u}$ $it-ta-din-\check{s}u$ LUGAL-ru $a-na$ PN_1

---

[540]The symbol ^{H} is for HI.A in Nougayrol's system.

[541]I.e., perhaps $nigi\underline{ss}u$ "cleft, fissure," perhaps referring to a prominent landmark in the area. On the double -gg-, note $ni-en-gi_5-\underline{s}a-at$, i.e., $ningi\underline{s}\underline{s}\bar{a}t$←$niggi\underline{s}\underline{s}\bar{a}t$ in KBo 13:1:rl0, cited in AHw, 787b.

"Moreover RN...took 3 *ikû*'s of the field of PN_3 and gave them (lit.: it) to PN_1." Lines 21ff. refer then to both transactions: ...LÚ *ma-am-ma-an l[a-a] i-la-qe eqlī*(A.ŠÀ.HI.A) *an-nu-ti iš-tu qa-ti* PN_1...*ù il-ku mim-ma ia-a-nu i-na eqlī*(A.ŠÀ.HI.A) *an-nu-û-ti* "No one may take these fields from PN_1...There is no feudal service in these fields."

4. *Unspecified (Impersonal) Subject*

As in K, the 3mp is employed to express an unspecified subject (or instead of a passive). Considering the number of texts in the corpus, there are very few examples: *ubru*[542] *ana bītīšu lā ušerrebū* "the *u.*-official will not be allowed to enter" 3:84:23; *gabba ša ibašši biri FN u biri PN izūzū* "Everything present was divided between FN and PN" 5:173:21ff.; cf. 3:66a:9ff.; *u unuššа ša bīti uppalū* "One will be responsible for the feudal service of the estate" 3:53b:20. Note also *PN ša taba''û*[543] *GN* "PN who is sought in GN" 6:74b:1f.

A 3ms impersonal verb may occur in *6:12a:11ff.: *il-te-qè* "one took"; however, this should probably be emended to *il-le!-qè* (N), as suggested by Nougayrol.[544]

---

[542]Perhaps the nom. is used because theword was felt to be the logical subject. However, several other instances of incorrect nom. forms are attested, in which this interpretation would not be possible; see above, on the declension of the noun, pp. 217f.

[543]On this reading, see above, pp. 230f.

[544]See above, p. 249.

5. *Negation*

The negative adverbs *lā*[545] and *ul*[546] each occur in both the letters and the legal texts. Overall, *lā* occurs about three times more often than *ul*. Due to the preponderance of legal texts, they usually express prohibition (negative commands).[547] In this use, *ul* occurs, with very few exceptions, only with the verbs *leqû*, *erēbu*, and *ekēmu*. *lā* occurs more often than *ul* with *leqû* and *erēbu*, but never with *ekēmu*; and it is used in nearly all other prohibitions. Some examples: *mamman...ul ekkimšu* "No one may take it" 3:46:21ff.; in 3: 128, note *amīlu mamman ul ilaqqēšu* l.14, but *amīlu mamman lā ilaqqēšu* l.27;[548] *hazannu āli u akil eqlēti lā imallik elīšu* "The town mayor and the overseer of the fields may have no power over him" 3:135a:15f.; *u lā tašakkan hubullam-mi ina berīni* "Do not put interest between us" *3:19:22f.

Both adverbs occur in simple assertions: *u šarru lā iddūkšanūt[i]* "but the king did not kill them" 3:97:22;

---

[545]Written both *la* and *la-a*, p. In 6:74b(Ec.), *lā* has twice been combined with the following word, which in each case began with *a-*: *la-lak* for *lā allak* (1s dur.) in l.4; *la-li-ku* for *lā ālikū* (participle) in l.9.

[546]Written both *ul* and *ú-ul*, p.

[547]There is often a fine line between prohibition and simple assertion; note, e.g., *ubru [an]a bītīšu ul errub-ma alapšu imēršu...u gabbu mimmûšu ana ekalli ul errub-ma* "The u.-official may not/will not enter his house, and his ox, ass, ..., and everything of his will(do not have to) enter the palace" 3:161:20ff.

[548]Similarly in 3:169:8f.(*ul*),17ff.(*lā*); note *lā irag-gum* "may not contest" in l.18. In 3:98, we have *lā e-ru-b[u]* "may not enter" in l.25, but *ul i-r[u-bu]* in l.26.

[ad]îni ul ikšudanni "they have not reached me as yet" 5:87:
24; also in questions: abūya ul î[d]e "Does my father not
know?" ibid.:19, but enūma atta šiprāti ša harrāni lā tîde
"Now then, doe you not know the affairs of (my) trip?" *5:
145f.:9f. In a non-verbal clause, ul is used: ul bēlni
attā-mi "you are not our lord" 3:114:20.

In the sole subordinate clause with a negative, and in
protases after šumma, only lā is attested: adi lā iddin-mi
ardîka "as long as he had not given your servants" *3:19:13f.;
šumma...lā tamang[ur] "if...(FN) does not agree" 3:60b:10ff.;
šumma PN imāt u FN...l[ā] uşşi "if PN dies and FN...does not
want to leave" 3:55:15ff.; cf. also *5:142:19f. No negatives
occur in any of the relative clauses.

To negate a word that is not the predicate, lā is used:
amāt [l]ā [b]anîta "an improper (or evil) thing" 5:87:16f.

The particle yānu[549] is used to predicate non-existence.
Usually, the noun for which it is the predicate is in the
nom., as in native Akk.:[550] e.g., pilku yānu ina eqli annî
3:122:18f. Occasionally however, the noun is in the acc.,[550a]
as the "object" of yānu: e.g., pilka yānu ina eqli annî ša
GN 3:128:17. Perhaps this reflects underlying WS influence,

_____

[549]Written ia-nu in 3:82:25; 3:116:r9'; 3:122:18; 3:123:
19; 3:125:r3'; 3:128:17,30; 3:129:7; 3:134:26; 3:142a:7; 3:
146a:13; 3:152:r4'; 3:156:18; 3:159a:18; 6:45:25; ia-a-nu in
3:117:r10; 3:124:11,18; 3:136:22; 3:160a:25; 6:33:22; i-ia-nu
in 3:126:25; *5:146:15.

[550]Cf. the examples in CAD I/J, 323; Aro, Glossar, 42.

[550a]yānu is always construed with the acc. at Byblos;
see Moran, "Byblos," 14f.; also, W.F. Albright and W.L. Moran,
JCS 2 (1948), p. 248 (n. 28).

since particles and verbs of (non-)existence there regularly
govern the acc.[551] Word order in clauses with *yānu* is dis-
cussed above, pp. 302f.

The vetitive does not occur in U.

6. *The Particle* lū

lū[552] is extremely rare in U. It occurs in only one
of the legal texts, meaning "whether...or": *lū māru lū*
mārt[u ša] PN "whether son or daughter of PN" 3:102:18.

In the letters, it occurs before the stative and in
non-verbal clauses to express a will toward a state or con-
dition (as in K; see above, p. 112); it occurs before the
subject in *lū šulmu ana muhhīka* "Health be to you" e.g., 4:
294:5, and *ana muhhi bēltya lū šulmu* e.g., *3:5:5f.; before
the predicate with the stative: *u lū zakû* "that they be
free (of claims)" *5:142:30.[553] With a preformative stative,
note: ⌜u⌝ *lū īde* "that I may know" 5:88:36.

In the only other attestation of *lū*, it serves as an
asseverative particle:[554] *u lū ittami* "And indeed he swore"

---

[551]Note Hebrew *'ênennî* "I am not," with the acc. 1s
suffix, e.g., Exodus 8:17. Arabic *kāna* and its "sisters"
also take the acc.; cf. Wright, *GAL* II, pp. 94f.

[552]Always written *lu-û*.

[553]For *lu ga-mi-ir-mi* in ibid.:15, read probably *lugam-
mir-mi* "let me finish"; see above, p. 233, and n. 252.

[554]Cf. *GAG* §81f. On *lu-û-ma-[al-li]* in 5:7:5', see
above, p. 233, n. 253. Note that asseverative *lū* does not
occur in K.

*3:19:12f.[555]

Note that *lū* is never used to strengthen the negative in prohibitions, as often happens in K.

7. *Non-Coordinating Enclitic -ma*

In U, -ma occurs more often as an emphasizing particle than as a connector. Very often, it marks the logical predicate of a sentence:[556] e.g., *ištēnšu PN abūšu-ma iddin-šunu* "First, it was PN his father who gave them" 3:97:7f.;[557] *aššum dīntšu-ma nadin nidnuš* "It was because of his judgment that his gift was given" 3:68:11f.; *u pilku ina eqli šuwāti yānu pilka(m)-ma mur'ū rābiṣi uppal* "There is no feudal service in this field; it is for the service of the *m.*-officials that he will be responsible" 3:146:13f.; cf. 3:116:r9'f.; 6: 33:21ff.[558] In these last three texts, -ma is strangely placed on the nomen regens (always *pilku*), rather than on the genitive, which is the word that should be emphasized. The same is true in 3:91:8'ff.: *u eqlēt GN₁ ša ultu dārīti ša*[559] *ina qāti amīlī GN₂ ina qāti(m)-ma amīlī GN₂* "and the

---

[555]Note also, in a nominal clause: ⌈*u i⌉nanna anāku ana šarri šamši bēⁱyⁱ lū ardum(ÌR.MEŠ)-ma* "And now, I am truly a servant to the king, the Sun, my lord" **EA47:10f.

[556]See above, p. 113, and n. 310.

[557]Cf. perhaps also ⌉ŠEŠ-*šu-ma*⌈ in 3:124:21.

[558]Cf. also 3:88:6; 3:92:18; 3:102:16; *5:112:14'. In 3:150:r5', the text is too badly broken to determine the function of -ma in *mannum-ma*.

[559]On the extra *ša*, see below, p. 335.

fields of GN$_1$, which always belonged to the men of GN$_2$,
still belong to the men of GN$_2$"; cf. also *ll*.4'ff. This
sentence must be compared with 3:88:2ff.: *RN...ittaši bīt*
marṣa'ī u iddinšu ana marṣa'ī-ma ana mārīšunu ana dārīti
"RN...took the house of the *m*.'s, and gave it to (those)
very *m*.'s (and) to their sons, forever." Both of these texts
are, as Nougayrol labels them, confirmations of traditional
land-holdings. The *-ma* emphasizes the identity of the for-
mer and future tenants.[560]

In nominal clauses, the grammatical predicate is some-
times marked by *-ma*:[561] e.g., *inanna anāku ana šarri bēlīya*
lū ardum-ma **EA47:13f.; *u kīšū-ma*[562] *šunū-ma* "and they
(will be treated) similarly" 5:10:23. In the latter passage,
the adverb is the predicate; *-ma* on the subject is presu-
mably for emphasis. Note also *ana X akannā-ma* "(It is)
likewise for X" 3:181:*p*.(Ec.).

Sometimes it is not as obvious that the particle marks
its word as the logical predicate. Nevertheless, as in
šunū-ma, just cited, it still denotes emphasis. This is
especially true with adverbs and adverbial expressions:[563]
e.g., *ana šarri bēlīšu anih danniš danniš-ma* "He is very,

---

[560] Cf. *GAG* §123a(β).

[561] Cf. *GAG* §123a(γ).

[562] This word is always followed by *-ma*; cf. *CAD* K, 465a.

[563] There is probably no special emphasis in the unique
example *ištu ūmi annîm-ma Sy*18:249:1 (vs. scores of examples
without *-ma*).

very loyal to the king his lord" 3:141:29f.; *u idd[inšu] ana PN...ana dārītim-ma* "And he gave it to PN...forever" 3:50a: 7ff., cf. 14; 3:48a:9 (but compare the much more frequent *ana dārīti*, e.g., 3:51:19).[564]

Even on verbs, *-ma* is usually not a connector (see below): e.g., *u amīl GN l[î]l[î]-ma* (end of letter) "And let PN come up" *5:137:9f.; *šarru ana PN ittadinšunū-ma ana dāri dūri ana mārīšu mamma lā...ilaqqēšu* "The king gave them to PN forever, (and) to his sons. No one...may take them(lit.: it)" 3:90a:9ff.[565] Also, when *-ma* and *u* both occur, it is unlikely that *-ma* acts as a conjunction; examples are given in the next section. As in K,[566] the purpose of the particle in all these cases, unless it is simply to emphasize the verb, an unlikelihood, is not clear. It is possible that it reflects the Ugaritic enclitic *m* in some instances, but the function of that particle is also not well understood as yet.[567] The same possibility may apply to a few occurrences of *-ma* on the other parts of speech, when no particular emphasis seems to be intended: e.g., *šanīta*

_____

[564]Cf. also *EA*45:15 (vs. *l.*23); **EA*46:5; 3:83:28; 3: 102:12; 3:167:15; 5:10:24; 6:28:9

[565]Cf. 3:101f:11f., where *ilaqqēšū-m[a]* is followed by *appūnā-ma*, which almost certainly begins a new sentence; and 6:32:14, where *uppal-ma* is in a subordinate clause, and is followed by the main clause. It is also doubtful that *-ma* in *qibī-ma* in letter introductions, *p.*, was considered a conjunction by U scribes.

[566]4:157:42ff., 4:193:13ff., quoted above, p. 115.

[567]*UT* §11.4-8, pp. 103f.

bit maškani(KI.LÁH.MEŠ) : *hê-ya-ma*[568] *ša PN₁...ana PN₂
iddinšu* "Moreover he gave PN₂ the lot of PN₁" 3:103:15f.

In the formula *umma PN(-ma)* "thus (speaks) PN," which
identifies the sender of a letter, *-ma* always occurs in
native Bab. texts.[569] But in U, it appears only four times
in the 12 letters whose introductions are preserved.[570]
There is no apparent reason or pattern to the occurrence or
lack of the particle in this circumstance. Perhaps, not
understanding its function, or its origin,[571] the scribes
simply forgot it most of the time.

Finally, in several instances, what appears to be the
particle *-ma* is more likely part of the Ugaritic pl. mor-
pheme; these are listed above, pp. 216f.

8. *Coordination of Clauses*

a. Coordination with *-ma*.[572]

-ma is extremely rare as a conjunction in U. The only
relatively certain examples of this use of the particle are:

---

[568]In three other texts, this word, which is probably
Ugaritic, occurs without *-ma*: 3:87:r7',9'; 3:95:6; 3:123:6,11.

[569]Cf. Salonen, *Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*, 57f.
for MB, and 16 for OB.

[570]With *-ma*: *EA*49:2; 5:87:4; 5:97:3; *5:137:3, but not
l.11; also without *-ma*: 3:4:3; *3:19:1; 4:294:1f.; *5:141:1;
*5:145f.;1,20; 5:147:1; *6:2:3; *6:11:1.

[571]Cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff.

[572]All the occurrences of *-ma* in U not covered in the
previous section are cited in this one, except for the com-
mon *qibî-ma* in letter introductions.

iššī-ma šarru RN tuppa ana PN...ittadin "RN the king took
and gave a tablet to PN..." 3:72:10ff.; *ubru [an]a bītīšu
ul errub-ma alapšu imēršu...u gabbu mimmûšu ana ekalli ul
errub-ma iššī-ma šarru bīt PN₁...u ittadinšu ana PN₂* "The u.-
official may not enter his house, and neither his ox, his
ass..., nor anything of his will enter the palace; and the
king took the estate of PN₁...and gave it to PN₂" 3:141:20ff.
(In contrast to this text, however, note: *ubru ana bītīšu
lā irrub ina mārī šipru šarri lā illak haptru ana bītīšu
lā irrub* 3:105:53ff.; here the context and grammar are very
similar, yet *-ma* does not occur.) If *-ma* is in fact a con-
junction in these examples, there are too few of them to
discover its special nuances, or the restrictions on its
occurrence. Note, however, that in 3:141:20ff., the clauses
are reversible, a condition which precludes the use of *-ma*
in OB (and in K).[573]

  -ma is also found a few times on the predicate of the
first of two clauses connected by *u*. It was noted above
(p. 126), that *-ma u* occurs sporadically in OB with the
meaning "and also"; *-ma* and *u* thus form a double conjunction,
and both contribute to its special meaning. The sole in-
stance of *-ma u* in K also fits this description. But we
have just seen that in U, *-ma* is very rare as a conjunction,
and, earlier (section 7, above), that it more often occurs

_____

[573]For the notion of "reversibility," and for references,
see above, pp. 117ff.

on verbs without having that function. Thus, it should probably also not be considered a conjunction, or part of one, when it occurs with *u*. The examples bear this out, as the following parallel passages illustrate: *u nahlaptašu išakkan-ma ana sikkūri(*^{GIŠ}*SAG.KUL) u ipaṭṭar ana sūqi* "And he will place his cloak on the door-bolt and depart into the street" *Syl*8:249:22f.; but without *-ma*: *u nlahlaptašu anla* ^{GIŠ}*sū-qi-ri išakkan u itte(ṣ)ṣi ana sūqi* 5:177:8ff. Note also *iššī-ma...u ittadinšu* 3:141:20ff. (quoted in full above), and compare the ubiquitous examples of *ittaši...u ittadin(šu)*, e.g., 3:52:3ff.[574]

b. Coordination with *u*.

The normal particle for connecting clauses is *u*. It connects both reversible and irreversible sequences, as in native Akk.[575] For the former type, note, e.g., *gabbu ṣābī ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u gabbu eleppētūya ina GN₂ ašbū* "All my ...-troops are stationed in GN₁, and all my ships are stationed in GN₂" 5:87:20ff. An example of the latter is the common formula *RN...ittaši X u iddin/ittadin(šu(nu)) ana PN* "RN...took X, and gave it(them) to PN" e.g., 3:85:2ff.,

_____

[574]Other examples are 3:54a:5ff.; 3:141:20; and probably *EA*45:18,25; *6:3:28. In one other instance, *-ma* seems curiously to emphasize a contrast or alternative: *hašhat FN u ana PN₁ tanaddinšu hašhat-ma u ana mārī PN₂ tanaddinšu ana šakni bītša tanaddinšu* "If FN wishes, she may give it to PN₁; or, if she wishes, she may give it to PN₂'s children, (or) she may give it to her major-domo."

[575]Again, for the terminology used here, and for references, see above, 117ff.

and *p*.

As in K (see above, pp. 122ff.), many of the occurrences of *u* are non-Akk. Thus, e.g., it connects clauses, the verbs of which are of different moods:[576] e.g., *bēl(ī)-dīnāti ina qāti PN attadinšunu ana m⌈uhhi bēlīya⌉ ileqqâššunūti u bē-l(u)ya PN kī damqi kī ṭābi ana pani šarrīšu qarr⌈ib⌉šu* "I have given these legal opponents to PN to take to my lord, and, my lord, present PN well and properly to his king" *3:5:22ff. Further, there are long strings of clauses connected with *u*: e.g., *RN...ittaši...u iddinšu...u ipturšu...u iš-kunšu...u...iškun* "RN...took...and gave it...and removed him ...and placed him...and placed..." 3:78:2ff. *u* is also often used to introduce new paragraphs; some examples are 5:98:r8', 13'; 3:84:25. Finally, in about half the examples of subordinate clauses, *u* connects them to the main clause: e.g., *enūma kī ušebbal šarru bēl(u)ya sisî...u hataddi aradka* "Whenever the king my lord sends/would send horses...your servant rejoices/would rejoice" 5:98:10ff.;[577] similarly, *u* connects protasis and apodosis in about one third of the conditional sentences: e.g., *šumma...FN lā tamang⌈ur⌉...u kasap terhatīša inandin* "If...FN does not agree..., he will give (her) the silver of her bride price" 3:60b:10ff.[578]

---

[576]See Patterson, "Parataxis," 32f., 42f., 50f., 73f.

[577]Cf. also *3:19:5; 3:68:7ff.; 3:110a:5ff. On subordinate clauses in general, see below, pp. 335ff.

[578]Cf. also 3:55f.:18ff.; 3:76a:4ff.; 3:110a:9ff.; 3:114:17ff.; 5:10:21ff. On conditional sentences, see pp. 330ff.

The probable WS origin of these various uses of *u* was discussed above (pp. 120ff.), in connection with the K texts. In addition to those observations, the mere fact of the pervasive, almost exclusive, use of *u* to connect clauses argues that coordination in general in U was according to WS rather than Akk. grammar.

c. Coordination with -*ma u*.

There are probably no instances of both -*ma* and *u* serving as conjunctions together. When both appear, it is unlikely that -*ma* is to be considered a conjunction. See above under -*ma* (section a), and *u* (section b).

d. Coordination with *ū*.

There are few certain examples of this conjunction, since, as in K, it is written the same as *u* "and" (i.e., *ū*). One example is: *mannum-mê ina libbīšunu ša izziz ina dīni itti FN ū ša uqallil FN ummašunu* "Whichever of them would stand in court against (lit.: with) FN, or would treat FN their mother disrespectfully" *Syl8:249f.:16ff.* Most other possible instances of *ū* involve alternative hypothetical conditions: e.g., *šumma...PN₁ ize''er PN₂ māršu...ū/u šumma PN₂ PN₁ abāšu ize''er...* "If...PN₁ rejects PN₂ as his son, ...; or/and/but if PN₂ rejects PN₁ as his father..." 3:55: 7ff.; cf. 3:114:13ff. Naturally, by the very nature of *ū*, the clauses it connects are fully reversible.

e. Asyndetic Coordination.

As elsewhere, most sequences of clauses connected by
a conjunction (in U, almost always *u*) can be paralleled by
other sequences where no conjunction appears.[579] In OB (and
in K, see above, pp. 128f.), the only sequences excluded
from this generalization are those in which the verbs are
of different moods. This is probably true in U as well, al-
though it is often difficult to determine whether two clauses
are semantically connected, or whether in fact the second
begins a new thought, and so a new sentence.

As a clear example of an asyndetically joined clause,
note: *inanna anumma 1600 šiltāha erî ina qāti PN atta[din]*
ana muhhi šarri bēltya ileqqâššunūti "Now then I hereby give
1600 copper arrowheads to PN to take to the king my lord"
*3:5:12ff., cf. 21ff.

9. *Subordination*

a. Conditional Sentences.

The only certain unmarked conditional sentence is a
double one: *urram šēram hašhat FN u ana PN₁ tanaddinšu*
hašhat-ma u ana mārî PN₂ tanaddinšu ana šakni bītša tanad-
dinšu "In future, if FN wishes, she may give it to PN₁; (or)
if she wishes, she may give it to the children of PN₂; (or)
she may give it to her major-domo(?)" 3:53:10ff.

In all other conditional sentences, the protasis is
introduced by *šumma*. There are two instances in which the

───────────────

[579]Cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 161.

protasis consists of more than one clause. In one, both are begun by *šumma*: *u šumma urram šēram mannum-mē ša šarrutta ...eppaš u šumma* [*mann*]*um-ma(?) ušamraṣ ūšunūti* [*u*](?) *illa-kūn*[*im-m*]*a ana muhhi bēltya* "An if in future there is someone who exercises kingship..., and if someone(?) causes them trouble, they may come to my lord" *6:3:24ff. The other example has three clauses in the protasis, but only the first and third have *šumma*: *šantta šumma PN₁ imāt*(BA.UG₇) *u FN* [*ašš*]*atšu ištu bītīša l*[*ā*] *uṣṣi šumma PN₂* [*ī*]*ze''erša u 80 kaspa...talaqqe* "Moreover if PN₁ dies, and FN his wife does not want to leave her house, and (lit.: if) PN₂ rejects her, she will take the 80 silver..." 3:55:15ff. There are no cases in which *šumma* is repeated within one clause.

In about one third of the examples, the apodosis is introduced by *u*, presumably due to WS influence.[580] As in K, some texts have apodoses both with and without *u*, e.g., 3:55:7ff.,11ff.(both without *u*), but 18ff.(with *u*).

The protasis may be a nominal clause, as in *u šumma urram šēram mannum-mē ša šarrutta...eppaš* "if in future there is someone who exercises kingship..." *6:3:24f. In

---

[580]See above, pp. 328f. For the "*waw* of apodosis" in Ugaritic, note, e.g., *w . hm . ḫt ./ ᶜl . w . likt / ᶜmk . w . hm / l . ᶜl . w . lakm / ilak* "And if the Hittites come up, I will send a message to you; and (even) if the do not come up, I will certainly send a message to you" *UT* 1013:16ff., p. 218. In general, cf. S.B. Parker, "Studies in the Grammar of the Ugaritic Prose Texts" (Ph. D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967), §3.22. For other WS dialects, and "*u* of apodosis" elsewhere, see above, p. 124, n. 344.

two instances, the stative occurs: *šumma urra šēra anāku mītāku* "if in future I should die" 3:76a:7f.; the other is the unmarked condition in 3:53:10ff., quoted in the first paragraph of this section. The apodosis is frequently a nominal clause: e.g., *šumma innabbittū 100 kaspu elīšunu* "If they flee, they owe 100 silver" 3:37b:9f.

Most often, both the protasis and the apodosis contain fientic verbs. The condition being conjectured is always in the future, very often emphasized by the adverb phrase *urra(m) šēra(m)* "in future." There are no examples in which the action would have taken place in the past, as in 3:8: 28ff. in K (see above, pp. 132f.). The tense in the protasis in U is thus normally the dur., as in K, again in contradistinction to native Akk. usage at this time.[581] There are some exceptions, however; see below, pp. 345ff., where the use of the tenses in U is discussed in detail. The tense in the apodosis is also usually the dur., although sometimes the prec. or imper. is used, correctly, and sometimes the pret. occurs, incorrectly; again, see below, 345ff., for examples and further discussion.

In the three protases with a negative, *lā* is used.[582]

b. Relative Clauses.

One relative clause is introduced by the general rela-

---

[581]See above, p. 131, nn. 364-7, for references.

[582]3:55:15ff., 3:60b:10ff.; *5:142:19f. The examples are quoted above, p. 320.

tive *mannum-mê*:[583] *DN liqqur [mannu]m-mê ištu awâte [annât]i*

inakkir "May DN destroy whoever disputes these words" 3:108:

19f.[584]

All other relative clauses are introduces by *ša*. Quite

often, the determinative pronoun has no antecedent. In such

cases, the relative clause may serve as the subject of its

sentence, as in *ša dīna iṣabbat X kaspa...iddin* "Whoever

starts a legal case must pay X silver..." 3:92:14ff.; or as

the direct object, as in *ša ušbalkit nidna annâ DN liš'alšu*

"May DN hold responsible (lit.: ask) whoever overturns this

gift" 3:84:25ff. Such clauses are not attested as any other

part of speech in the main clause.[585]

More commonly, *ša* has an antecedent, either a noun or

a pronoun. In these cases, the relative clause modifies its

antecedent, following it (and its other modifiers) immedi-

ately: e.g., *rābiṣu ša uštēṣi kunuk šarri* "the prefect who

brought out the royal seal" 3:169:25f.

Relative clauses may be verbal, as in the examples al-

ready quoted, or nominal as in *2 bītāt PN₁ ša [ina] panānu*

---

[583]On the subjunctive in U, see above, pp. 242f. For
mannum-mê, see *AHw*, 603b (2a).

[584]The interpretation of this passage offered here is
discussed above, pp. 205f., and n. 144.

[585]When such a clause would in effect be a genitive de-
pendent on a noun, it is topicalized as a casus pendens, and
resumed by a pronominal suffix; see *GAG* §165k. An example
in U is: *ša tuppu annâm unakkir ilānu šumšu lihalliq* "May
the gods destroy the name of whoever alters this tablet" 3:
105:56f. (for **ilānu šum(a ša) ša...unakkir lihalliq(ū)*).

ana PN_2 "PN_1's 2 estates, which formerly (belonged) to PN_2"
3:103:13. Such nominal relative clauses are especially com-
mon in the descriptions of the various plots of land that
are the concern of so many of the legal texts: e.g., *eqla*
ša ina eqel GN "the field which (is) in the field of GN" 3:
143f.:19; etc. More often in such situations, however, *ša*
does not appear, so that in effect an adverbial (preposi-
tional) phrase modifies a noun, a situation which never
occurs in K.[586] A few examples are: *kirâ ina eqel āli*
"the orchard in the town field" ibid.:6f.; *bīta eqla ša PN*
šatammi ina GN "the estate (and) field of PN the steward in
GN" 3:81:4f.; *u eqel PN ammaka* "the field of PN there" 3:48:
15f.; etc. There is no apparent difference in nuance whether
ša is used or not.

The determinative pronoun may be the subject of its
clause: e.g., *ša ilaqqe bītu...ištu qāti PN* "whoever takes
the estate...from PN" 3:52a:17ff.; or the direct object:
ana mārī ša tullad "to the sons whom she will bear" 5:5:6'.
When it is the object, it is only once resumed by a suffix
on the verb: *bīta šanâ ša rābiṣu ittadinšu*[587] "another es-
tate which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f. There are no exam-
ples in which *ša* represents any other part of speech in its

---

[586]See above, pp. 136f., and n. 382.

[587]The suffix could also be dat., referring to the PN
in *l*.4 to whom the property was given: "...which the pre-
fect gave him." However, it was noted above (p. 199), that
dat. suffixes are not common in U.

clause.

In no example in these texts does *ša* govern more than one clause. If more than one relative clause modifies a single antecedent, *ša* is repeated: *minum-mê ša ibašši ana yâši ša tartēši FN* "All that I have, that FN acquired" *Sy*18: 249:4ff.; cf. ibid.:16ff, quoted above, p. 329.

In a very few instances, *ša* is repeated without purpose later in the relative clause:[588] e.g., *u ša FN mārat PN aššat(a)ya ištu ahīya ša ihuzši* "and whoever takes (in marriage) FN, the daughter of PN, my wife, from my brother" 3:76a:6ff.; in a non-verbal clause: *u eqlēt GN₁ ša ultu dārīti ša ina qāti amīlī GN₂* "the fields of GN_1 which have always been in the hands of the men of GN_2" 3:91a:8'ff. The reason for the extra *ša* is not known.

No negatives occur in any of the relative clauses.

The main clause is never continued by *u* after a relative clause, as happens occasionally at Nuzi.[589]

c. Other Subordinate Clauses.[590]

As in K (above, pp. 138ff.), there are very few other subordinate clauses, especially considering the number of

---

[588]This phenomenon is often encountered at Nuzi; cf. Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch,* pp. 82f. Note especially his last two examples, in which the relative clause modifies the subject of the main clause: *mannu/mannum-mê ša ina libbīšunu ša ašbu šeʾa ana PN umalla* "Whoever lives among them will pay the grain to PN" *HSS* 9:74:13f.; 9:69:13ff.

[589]Cf. Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch,* pp. 54, 82f.

[590]On the subjunctive in U, see above, pp. 242f.

texts in the corpus. In all but two instances, the subor-
dinate clause precedes the main clause. The exceptions are
noun clauses, both introduced by *kī*, and both in questions.[591]
One acts as object of the verb "to know": *abūya ul īⁱ[d]e kī*
gabbu ṣābū ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u gabbu eleppētūya ina GN₂
ašbū[592] "Does my father not know that all my ...-troops are
stationed in GN₁ and all my ships in GN₂?" 5:87:19ff.; the
other is subject of an impersonal predicative verbal adjec-
tive: *bani akanna ina pa<nī>ka kī yānu karānū...* "Does it
seem right to you this way, that there are no vineyards..."
*5:146:12ff.[593] These are the only noun clauses attested.

When the main clause follows the subordinate, it does
so immediately nine times,[594] but is introduced by *u*[595] in
four other instances.[596]

There are two comparative clauses, both begun by *kīma*:

---

[591]Noun clauses serving as objects of certain verbs
regularly follow the main clause in MB; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 154;
GAG §177c. Note that *kī* is used there as well.

[592]*kī* governs two clauses here.

[593]No examples of *bani kī* "it is good that" are listed
in *CAD* B, 81ff., only *bani ša* (NA, NB; p. 83: 4'). *banû* be-
gins to replace *damqu* in MB (ibid., 83b). In Byblos, note
damiq inūma (for *kī*) *iṣbat GN* "Is it right that he seize GN?"
*EA*84:36; cf. Moran, "Byblos," 67ff. For *undu...ṣamit* 3:72a:
9ff., see below, and n. 600.

[594]Seven times, if *enūma* is an adverb rather than a con-
junction (see below).

[595]See above, p. 328.

[596]Three times, if *enūma* is an adverb rather than a con-
junction (see below).

kīma [DN] *zakât zaki* "As DN is pure, he is 'pure' (i.e., free of claims)" 3:107:5f.; cf. *kīma DN zakki*[597] ⌈*u*⌉ (?) *zakât FN* 3:110a:5f. *kīma* is not used for any other type of clause.[598]

Two temporal clauses begin with *adi*: *šanîta* [*ad*]*i pilka šaš*[*u*]...*PN uppal-ma*[599] *mamman lā ilaqqēšu*... "Moreover as long as PN is responsible for that feudal service..., no one may take it..." 6:32:12ff.; *u lū ittami adi lā iddin-mi ardīka kasap iptertēšunu ana yâši* "And he swore, as long as he has not given your servants, the silver for their ransom (will remain) with me" *3:19:12ff.

The word *undu* occurs three times. As in K (pp. 139f.), it is more likely a conjunction than an introductory adverb, although the latter possibility cannot be ruled out. In two instances, it would be a temporal conjunction: *undu taltapra u taqtebi mā*... "When you wrote me, you said...(long quote)" *3:19:5ff.; *undu PN₁...PN₂...u* [*PN₃*] *hitta rabâ ītep*[*šu*] *kunukka meher kunuk šarri rabî ītepšū* "When PN₁..., PN₂...,

_____

[597]On the agreement (the stative should be f.), see above, n. 529, pp. 313f. This could be a prepositional phrase, "like pure DN," as is most often the case in this formula; cf. *kīma DN zakîti/zakâti* 3:57:17; 3:66a:3f.; 3:111b: 10f.; 5:15:r2',8'. However, since a comparative clause is possible, as demonstrated by 3:107:5f., the writing *za-ak-ki*, without the extra vowel sign (for *zak(k)i*), argues that the form is in the predicative state.

[598]In MB, *kī* is used for comparative clauses; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 154. In fact, *kīma* is only very rarely attested in MB (cf. ibid., 149, 153f.), while it is the normal form in OB (*GAG* §178a).

[599]See above, pp. 324f., for *-ma*.

and PN$_3$ committed a great crime, they made a seal, a copy of the great royal seal" 3:97:13ff. The other example is more difficult, but it seems likely that a causal clause is intended: *undu eqlu ṣamit iššī-ma RN šarru tuppa PN... ittadin* "Since the field is transferred, RN the king took and gave a tablet to PN..."[600] 3:72a:9ff. (If *undu* is instead an adverb, the passages would mean, respectively: "Now then, you wrote and said:..."; "Now then,...committed a great crime: (namely,) they made a seal..."; and "Now then, the field is transferred. RN the king...")

It was shown above (pp. 140f.), that *enūma* is probably an adverb in K. The evidence in U is less clear, and it remains equally possible that it is a conjunction. The examples are: *inūma nakir PN$_1$ tupšarru itti šarri bēlīšu u PN$_2$ idūkšu* "When(Now then,) PN$_1$ the scribe was at war with the king his lord, (but) PN$_2$ killed him" 3:68:7ff.; *bēlī enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka mā...inanna anumma...atta[din]* "My lord, since(now then,) the king my lord has written to his servant: '...',(.) I hereby now give..." *3:5:9ff.; *enūma zēr hurati ṣabûtuya zēr hurhurati šûbilanni* "Since(Now then,) h.-seed is my desire,(;) send me h.-seed" *6:12a:7ff.[601] The same ambiguity is present

---

[600]The translation in *CAD* Ṣ, 94a, "that the field had been transferred," is due to a misdivision of sentences, taking the *undu*-clause with the previous sentence. It is improbable that *undu* ever means "that" as *CAD* has it.

[601]The clauses *enūma it-ya šulmu* (twice) and *enūma atta ...lā tīde* in *5:145f.:6,24,9f., respectively, are of no

in the following example: *bēlī enūma kī ušebbal šarru*
bēl(u)ya sisî...u hataddi aradka "My lord, (now then) when-
ever the king my lord sends/would send horses..., you ser-
vant rejoices/would rejoice" 5:98:10ff. It cannot be deter-
mined whether *enūma* here forms a compound conjunction with
kī,[602] or whether it is simply an adverb.

The subordinate clause in the following is probably
causal, but the restorations are by no means certain: *kīmê*
[*šarru(?)] ištu [GN(?)] illa[k...]*[603] *šupra[m-mi/a] dīna*
"Since the king(?) is going out of GN(?), send me the case"
*5:141:10ff. This is the only occurrence of *kīmê* as a con-
junction in U.[604]

The conjunction *kī* occurs three times, in addition to
the two examples quoted above; one is in a damaged text, and
the exact meaning of *kī* cannot be determined: *abūya anu[mm]a*
kī altapa[r[605]...] "My father, now then, since/when(?) I
wrote..." 5:81:9'. The other two are both of the form:

---

help due to this scribes extremely poor knowledge of Akk.
See above, p. 165, and n. 3.

    602I know of no other such compounds, except with *ša*.

    603If the other restorations, which are Nougayrol's,
are correct, the verb expected here is *(w)aṣû*, not *alāku*.

    604It occurs as a preposition in 3:111b:10.

    605Nougayrol, followed by Berger (*UF* 2, 285), reads
il_x-ta-p[ár(?). Since the context is so broken, and quite
unintelligible, I do not understand the insistence, despite
having to read *il_x*, on a 3ms verb. In the copy, *pá[r]*
looks fairly certain:

aššum X *kī* + verb.[606]   Normally in MB, when *kī* is immedi-
ately before the verb, it indicates a temporal clause (past
tense).[607]   However, in both of our examples, the context
makes a causal clause more likely.   Thus, each of the *aššum*-
phrases must be a casus pendens.   The passages are: *bēlī*
aššum dīni ša PN *kī tašpura ana muhhi* [*ardīka*] *inanna...al-*
takan "My lord, concerning the case of PN--because you wrote
to your servant, I have now placed..." 3:4:9ff.; *aššum alpīya*
ša iltarqū amīlū GN *kī taqtab*[*i*] *mā...anumma dīna šaš*[*u*]
gummir "Concerning my oxen which the men of GN stole--because
you wrote (saying): '...', now complete that case" *5:141f.:
7ff.   Note that both *kī* and *kīmê* (see above) occur in *5:
141f., with the meaning "since, because."   These last two
subordinate clauses, with *kī*, are peculiar in that, in K,
they would be relative clauses with *ša*: e.g., *aššum dīni ša*
haptrī ša tašpura "concerning the case of the Hapiru, about
which you wrote" 3:3:5f.; cf. also 3:6b:7f.; 5:94f.:5ff., 40ff.

As the examples show, punctive action in the past (or
so perceived, as in *adi...lā iddin*), may be expressed in the
subordinate clause by either the pret. or the perf.   The
dur. is used for habitual, durative, or future action.   The
stative, of course, expresses no tense or aspect.

---

[606]There is also *kī uqabbi*[3:157a:19', which Nougayrol
translates: "comme elle(?) (1')avait promis(?)."   However,
the text is badly damaged, and the context is not at all
clear.   *kī* could mean "since" or "when" just as readily.   It
is also possible that the verb should be read *ukabbi*[*t*].

[607]Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 147f.

The only occurrence of a negative in a subordinate clause is *lā* in *3:19:13.

10. *The Use of the Tenses*

a. Preterite and Perfect.

Generally, these two forms are almost completely inter-changeable, although one or the other tends to be preferred in certain circumstances, or with certain verbs. Thus, in the letters, the perf. never occurs after a negative; the only examples are: *ul ik-šu-da-ni* "they have not reached me" 5:87:24; *u bēl(u)ya lā iš-al-šu* "but my lord did not ask him" **EA47:13 (probably after a perf.: [*aš-ta-p*]*ár*); ⌜*lā*⌝ *ta-áš-pur* "you did not send" ibid.:20. But in the only example of a negative with a past tense in a legal text, the perf. is used: *šarru lā id-du-uk-šu-nu-t[i]*[608] "the king did not kill them" 3:97:22. Some verbs occur only in the pret. for past tense: e.g., *pašāru* (11 times[609]), *zukkû* (14 times[610]); others, only in the perf.: e.g., *qabû* (five times[611]), *ṣabātu* (five times[612]). But most verbs occur in

---

[608]On the reading, see above, p. 199, n. 121.

[609]3:35b:4; 3:113:5; 3:127f.:5,20; 3:143a:4,11; 5:8:5; 5:179:4; 5:263a:6; 5:263b:4; *RA*38:5:3.

[610]The form is always written *ú-za-(ak-)ki*, never with *uz*; thus, it is unlikely that it is a perf. The examples are: 3:32:3; 3:60a:13; 3:110a:4,8; 3:111:9; 3:112b:12; 3:140:4; 3:153f.:13,15,17; 5:15:r7',10'; 6:45:28; in 3:170b:13, the form is *ú-ze-ku-ú*.

[611]*3:19:5; 3:76a:3; 3:170b:7; 5:112:10'; *5:141:9.

[612]3:37a:4,11; 3:71b:5; 5:111f.:B4',13'.

both: e.g., *šakānu*,[613] *šapāru*,[614] *paṭāru*,[615] *nadānu*,[616]

našû,[617] *šūrubu*,[618] etc.

Another tendency is for the first verb in legal documents, after the opening phrase(s) *ištu ūmi annî(m) (ana panî RN/šībūti)* "From this day (in the presence of RN/witnesses)," to be a perf.: e.g., with *našû* (overwhelmingly[619]), *nadānu* (usually[620]), *leqû* (always[621]). However, this "tendency" may be superficial only, for the three verbs just mentioned comprise over ninety per cent of the examples of this circumstance; when they are eliminated, perf. and pret. occur as the first verb almost equally. For example, other perf.'s are *paṭāru* (6:44:5; *Sy*18:251:4), *qabû* (3:76a:3; 5:176:3), *ṣabātu* (3:37a:4,11; 3:71b:5). But other introductory verbs are pret.: *pašāru* (nine times[622]), *zukkû* (six times[623]),

---

[613]Pret.: 3:78:10,13; 3:162b:5; perf.: 3:4:13; 3:134:11; 3:140:5.

[614]Pret.: 3:4:10; *EA*45:25; **EA*47:20; perf.: *3:5:9; *3:19:5; 4:294:11; 5:98:r2'; *6:12:16.

[615]Pret.: 3:78:8; perf.: 3:83:27; 6:44:5.

[616]Pret.: 3:48a:6; 3:49b:8; and *p*.; perf.: 3:142a:6; 3:142b:10; and *p*.

[617]Pret.: 3:46:7; 3:49a:12; 3:72:10; 3:92:4; 3:140f.:8,25(?); perf.: 3:48a:4; 3:49b:3; and *p*.

[618]Pret.: 5:173:6,11; perf.: 3:55:19; 3:64:10.

[619]At least 50 times perf., vs. once pret. (3:92:4).

[620]At least 15 times perf., vs. two pret. (3:47a:4; 3:147b:4).

[621]3:35a:4; 3:59b:5; 3:62:4; 3:87:5; 3:102:2; 3:130:3; 3:146a:5; 3:159b:6; 3:167:4; 5:9:4.

epēšu (3:45:6), *šāmu* (5:10:3), *wuššuru* (3:110b:4[624]), *nuk-kuru* (3:162b:4). The verb *rakāsu* even appears as a perf. in one text (3:55:5), and as a pret. in another (3:75a:5).

The pret. only rarely occurs after *anumma* or *inanna*,[625] whereas the perf. frequently does.[626]

There is also a tendency, once one of the forms has been used, for the scribe to continue using it in subsequent clauses. Note, e.g., *u ipṭuršu...u iškunšu...u...iškun* "and he released him...and placed him...and placed..." 3:78:8ff. (but the first verb, *l.4*, is *ittaši*);[627] *...talteqe u taptaṭar u anaku...[a]ttadnaššu* "she has taken...and departed, and I...have given...to him" 3:83:26ff.[628] However, "sequences" of both pret....perf., and perf....pret. are also found, with no apparent difference in nuance; note: *...šarru unakkeršu u iltakanšu...* "the king removed him...and placed him" 3:134:10f. (but *RN...[un]akker PN...u iškunšu* 3:162b: 3ff.); *RN...ittaši...u iddinšu* "RN...took...and gave it" 3:

---

[622]See above, n. 609.

[623]3:32:3; 3:107a:4; 3:110a:4; 3:140:4; 5:181:4; *Syl8*: 253:9.

[624]Reading *û-wa-aš-šer₉*; cf. Moran, "Syrian Scribe," 150f.

[625]Only 3:103:14; 5:10:25f.; 5:11:4f.

[626]Cf. 3:4:11ff.; *3:5:12ff.,21ff.; 3:49b:15ff.; 3:125: r5'ff.; 3:137a:8f.; 3:170b:7'f.; 4:294:8ff.; 5:98:r17'ff.; *6:12:14ff.; 6:48:8'ff.

[627]Cf. also 3:162b:4ff.: *[un]akker...u iškunšu*.

[628]Cf. also 3:71f.:5ff.: *iṣṣabat...u iltê*; *3:19:5: *taltapra u taqtebi*.

49:2ff., and often. This last example is a formula found at the beginning of most of the many legal texts involving royal land-grants.[629] In it there is one interesting development, which involves the use of the tenses: in the texts from the reigns of Niqmaddu II, Arhalba, and Niqmepa, *nadānu* in this formula occurs in both the pret. and the perf., the pret. being somewhat more frequent; but in the many texts of this type from the reign of Ammistamru II, the last great king of Ugarit, the pret. is found only rarely, the perf. having come to be used almost exclusively (*našû* in all reigns is almost always perf.[630]).[631]

Finally, there are quite a number of clauses in which the pret., but only once the perf., is used where a dur. is

---

[629]See Jonas C. Greenfield, "*našû-nadānu* and its Congeners," in Maria de Jong Ellis, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of J.J. Finkelstein*, Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Memoirs*, 19 (1977), 87ff.

[630]See above, n. 619.

[631]It must be pointed out that there are many texts in which the formula is repeated, e.g., in double or multiple grants, and others in which one or the other verb (especially) *nadānu*) is repeated, in clauses that further clarify or specify the transaction. Other texts begin simply with *nadānu* ("From this day the king has given"), or some other verb (e. g., *leqû*). Therefore, to simplify and control the statistics somewhat, the following figures include only the occurrences of *nadānu* when it is the second verb in the text, after *našû*, i.e., when the text begins *ištu ūmi annî(m) RN ittaši X u iddin/ittadin(šu(nu))* and PN. There are 59 texts in our sample; the occurrence of the pret. and perf. of *nadānu* is:

	iddin	ittadin
Niqmaddu II	11	6
Arhalba	3	2
Niqmepa	8	3
Ammistamru II	3	23.

expected. These will be discussed in detail below.

Apart from these observations, there appear to be no other conditions that determine the use of one form rather than the other. The examples cited above and in the notes bear abundant testimony to the fact that the pret. and perf. implied an identical range of tense and aspect to the U scribes, namely, punctual action in the past. Even in subordinate clauses, one finds both used indiscriminately, in constrast to native MB.[632] In relative clauses, note: *gabba mimmûšu ša iršû* "all her(!) property which she acquired" 3:110a:12f.; *bīta šanâ ša rābiṣu ittadinšu* "another house which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f. In other subordinate clauses: *kī tašpura* "since you wrote me" 3:4:10; *kī taq-tab[i]* "since you said" *5:141:7ff. Conditional sentences are discussed below.

It was mentioned above that the pret. often occurs when the context demands a dur.[633] The examples are found in

_____

[632]In MB, the perf. only rarely occurs in subordinate clauses; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 81. In the U texts, the pret. occurs 12 times: 3:4:10; *3:19:14f.; 3:110a:13; 3:170b:13'; 5:173:11; 3:76a:8; 3:84:25; 3:105:56; 3:154:17f.; *Syl*18:249:16f., 18f.,24f. In the last 7, the pret. replaces an expected dur.; i.e., it is future (see below). The perf. occurs 12 times: *3:19:5,10,20f.; 3:55f.:19,22; 3:90b:11; 3:157b:11; 3:169:25; 3:170b:8; *5:141:7,9; 5:263b:6. In *6:12a:12, the text has *ša il-te-qè* (perf.), but Nougayrol suggests emending to N pret.: *ša il-le!-qè*, probably correctly; see above, p. 249. After *enūma*, the perf. occurs once (*3:5:9), the pret. not at all.

[633]Because of the defective writing of double consonants, it is often difficult to determine whether a pret. or dur. is intended. As examples, note: *la i-ši-ib* (probably from *ešēbu*, either *iššib* or *īšib*) "may it not flourish" 3:76a:11,

several different types of clauses. First, the pret. occurs

in relative clauses which clearly mean "whoever does X (in

the future)": e.g., *ša tuppu annâm û-na-ke-er* "whoever al-

ters this tablet" 3:105:56; *ša [dīn]a û-na-mi-iš* "whoever

brings suit" 3:154:14f.; cf. also 3:76a:6ff.; 3:84:25f.;

*Sy*18:249f.:16f.,18f.,24f. These seven examples are in fact

almost double the number of times the expected dur. occurs

in this type of clause (3:54:16; 3:92:14; 3:52a:17ff.; *6:

3:24ff.).

In the other types of clauses, the dur. is the normal

form. In the second, the pret., with a negative, is used

as a prohibitive: e.g., *akil narkabti lā û-ma-'-er eli PN*

"The overseer of the chariotry may have no power over PN"

3:81:31ff.; *kussâ lā û-ra-bi* "May he not exalt (his) throne"

3:76a:10; *urram šēram mamman lā il-qè ištu qāti PN* "In fu-

ture, no one may take (it) from PN" 3:63a:11ff.; cf. *lā*

il-[qè] 3:135b:17.[634]

---

immediately after *lā û-ra-bi* (pret. for dur.); *û-ul e-kim-šu*
(*ekkimšu* or *ēkimšu*) "may not take it away" 3:67b:15; *it-te-ợi*
(probably Gt; see above, p. 244; dur. *itteợợi* or pret. *itteợi*)
"he will go away" 5:177:10. Other forms can be either dur.
or pret. because of the ambiguity of the vowel in certain
signs: e.g., *lā û-še-RI-bu* (dur. *ušerrebū* or pret. *ušēribū*)
"they may not send in" 3:84:23; or for other reasons: e.g.,
i-zê-er (dur. *izêr* or *ize''er*; pret. *izēr*) "(if) he rejects"
3:55:12 (cf. *i-zê-'-er ll.8,18*). The references for further
examples are cited below, p. 349, n. 645. In all these cases,
the "expected" tense, i.e., the dur., is assumed to be writ-
ten; but due to the not infrequent replacement of the dur. by
the pret., this assumption may often be incorrect.

[634]With these two examples of *ilqe* must be compared
the over 70 examples of this injunction ("no one may take")
with the dur. *ila/eqqe*.

Thirdly, the pret. is also found occasionally in as-
sertions in main clauses, alongside a verb or verbs in the
dur., when the context is clearly future: *ša dīna iṣabbat
2000 kaspa 1000 hurāṣa ana qāti PN i-din*[635] "whoever begins
legal proceedings will give 2000 silver and 1000 gold to PN"
3:92:14ff.; *u [...] i-na-aš-ši [...]...100 kaspa û-ma-al-[l]i
ina qāti ahhīšu u...i-šak-kán [u] it-te-ṣi*[636] *ana sūqi* "and
he will bear(?)...and(?) will pay 100 silver to his brothers
and will place...and will go away into the street" 5:176f.:
5ff.; cf. *Syl*8:249:16ff.[637]   Related to these are the in-
stances of the pret. in the apodoses of future conditional
sentences:[638] *šumma urra šēra PN inammuš dīna itti ahīšu
10 bilat kaspi i-din ana ahīšu u i-tû-ur ana bīt abīšu* "If
in future PN brings a case against his brother, he will give
his brother 10 talents of silver and return to his father's
house" 3:81:25ff.; *šum<ma> urram šēram PN i-tu-ur ana libbīšu
[X] kaspa û-ma-al-li ina qāti šarri* "If in future PN changes

---

[635]Perhaps *i-<na->din* should be read; cf. 3:68:3. How-
ever, scribal omissions are not common in U; and note future
i-din again in 3:81:28, quoted below.

[636]This form is probably a Gt (of *(w)aṣû*), either dur.
(itteṣṣi) or pret. *(itteṣi)*; see above, p. 244.

[637]Perhaps also *ù PN û-ra-ṣí-ip-šu-nu ù û-še-ši-ib-šu-nu*
"and PN will repair and settle them" 3:125:11'ff. The con-
text seems to require the future. The second verb could be
dur. *(ušeššibšunu)*, or another pret. *(ušēšibšunu)* used for
the dur.; the first verb is pret.

[638]The tense of the apodosis is normally the dur., as
seen, e.g., in 3:55:10,20; 3:60b:15(bis); 3:75a:11(bis); 3:
107:13; *6:3:28. The prec. or imper. may also occur in the
apodosis; see below.

his mind, he will pay X silver to the king" 5:179:7ff.; cf.
ibid.:12ff.; 5:173:15ff.; 3:60:13ff.(*i-pu-ul* *l*.17); perhaps
also 5:6:10'(*ti-ir-hu-us*); 6:53:r5'ff.(*û-ma-ni₇*(!?) *l*.8').

The conditional sentence in 5:179f.:7ff., just quoted,
brings up one final clause type to be considered: the pro-
tasis. Discounting the verb *târu* for the moment, the verb
of the protasis is dur. 11 times,[639] pret. once:([*šumma*
PN] *i-mu-ut* "if PN dies" 5:5:7');[640] and perf. once (*šumma*
PN tuppa šanâ it-ta-ši "if PN brings up another tablet" 5:
11:10f.). However, in the 14 times that *târu* occurs in a
protasis, five of the instances must be construed as pret.,[641]
and only two as dur.;[642] the other seven are pl., and could
be either tense.[643] Obviously then, apart from *târu*, the

---

[639]3:55:8,17(the clause in 16f. is still governed by
šumma in *l*.15),18; 3:60b:12(reading *ta-ma-an-g*[*ur*]; see
above, p. 244, n. 301); 3:81:26; 3:107:11; 3:114:19; 5:88:
34; *5:142:21; *6:3:27; and probably *EA*45:28: *šum-ma-mi*
tu-še-bā-[*al*] "if you send."

[640]Perhaps also 5:4:14': [*u*(?) *šumma*(?)] *PN i-mu-*[*ut*].
Note a parallel example with the stative: *šumma urra šēra*
anāku mītāku "if in future I should die" 3:76a:4f.

[641]3:33:12,15; 5:180:8; 6:53:r6'; *Sy*18:252:22. Note
also *i-tū-ur* "will return" in an apodosis, 3:81:29, quoted
above.

[642]Both forms are problematic; one is: *i-tu-ir-ru-ni₇*
(pl.) 6:39:13; this is the only case of a "broken spelling"
of a vowel in U. The other form is [*i-tu*]*-ur-ra* 5:180:13.
Since *i-tu-ur* occurs in *l*.8, and since the text is badly da-
maged, it is possible that *ur-ra* (of *urra šēra*) stands here,
although the text has *ur-ra-am* in *l*.7.

[643]*i-tu-ru-ni₇* 3:114:14; 3:170b:12'; 6:52a:r3'; *i-tu-*
ur-n[*i₇*] 5:181:8; *i-tū-ur-ni₇* 5:10:17,22; *i-tūr-ni₇* *Sy*18:
252:18; on these forms, see above, pp. 237f.

the dur. is the normal tense in the protasis.[644] Thus,

other forms in protases, which, because of the defective

writing system, could be either dur. or pret., should also

be considered dur.[645] The form $i\text{-}mu\text{-}ut$, and the instances

of $it\bar{u}r$, should be grouped with the verbs in the previous

paragraphs, as additional examples of the "incorrect" use of

the pret. for the dur. $it\text{-}ta\text{-}\check{s}i$ constitutes the only exam-

ple of the perf. usurping the function of the dur.;[646] it

does not seem to convey any special nuance.

Apart from the first type (the general relative clause,

"whoever does X"), the above pret. forms occur only spora-

dically. In none of the types of clauses is its use a hard

and fast rule; rather, the examples in each type can be

paralleled by other, usually more frequent, examples with the

---

[644] In OB, the verb of the protasis is often pret., some-
times perf. (GAG §161d-f); the dur. implies a will toward
something (GAG §161i). In MB, the perf. is the usual tense,
but again, the dur. can be used to imply a special (willful)
mood; cf. Aro, SMbG, 144f. There is no obvious mood expressed
by the dur. in the U examples; it is simply the normal tense
for the protasis.

[645] $i\text{-}z\acute{e}\text{-}er$ 3:55:12; $i\text{-}ze\text{-}er$ 3:75a:8,18; Sy28:174:13;
(these could be pret. $iz\bar{e}r$ or dur. $iz\hat{e}r$ or $ize\text{'}\text{'}er$; in favor
of the dur. is $i\text{-}z\acute{e}\text{-}\text{'}\text{-}er$ 3:55:8,18); $i\text{-}na\text{-}bi\text{-}it$ 3:37a:7,17;
$i\text{-}na\text{-}bi\text{-}tu_4$ 3:37b:9 (for pret. $innabit(t\bar{u})$, or dur. $innab\text{-}bit(t\bar{u})$; cf. GAG §97 1).

[646] For $it\text{-}te\text{-}ei$ "he will go away" see p. 244. In 3:65a:
22, read perhaps $[\check{s}i\text{-}i(t)$ $ta\text{-}l]aq\text{!?-}q\grave{e}$; cf. 3:56:20. In *3:
19:19, a prec. is expected, and so the verb should probably
be emended to $li\text{!}(UD)\text{-}te\text{-}er\text{-}mi$. Finally, in 3:137a:9ff.,
which reads u $inanna$ FN $tirtaeip$ $b\bar{\imath}ta$ $ann\hat{a}$, Nougayrol trans-
lates: "Et maintenant, FN (re)construira cette maison." But
there is no reason why the action could not already have
taken place: "Now then, FN has repaired..."

dur., which is the expected form. Since they cannot be explained by normal Akk. grammar, we must conclude either (a) that the scribes did not know the difference between the pret. and the dur., or (b) that the use of the pret. is due to substrate influence. The first alternative is improbable, because the two forms are usually correctly used. The dur., e.g., never occurs when the pret. (or perf.) is expected, with one possible exception (see below, section b, end). The second alternative is more likely: each of the "incorrect" pret.'s could represent a Ugaritic $yqtl$ form, e.g., $ilqe$ in 3:63a:12 is for Ugaritic *$yilqaḥ$. But there is a problem here too: the correspondence (without the initial y- in the Akk.[647]) fits only the examples where the pret. is used for a prohibition, where Ugaritic indeed has *$yaqtul$.[648] For the other examples, Ugaritic would probably have *$yaqtulu$,[649] and so we might expect a final $-u$ in the forms.[650] Yet, none of them have it.[651] We are thus left with the rather diffi-

---

[647]Unlike many of the verbs in the "West-Semitizing" texts from El-Amarna; cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 48ff.

[648]*UT* §9.10, p. 72.

[649]*UT* §9.10, pp. 71f. Of course, *$yaqtul$ is used as a historical present, but that is probably the case only in the literary texts, not in the spoken language. Perhaps final short vowels were beginning to be lost in Ugaritic; a phenomenon that might also be indicated by the many incorrect case-endings on nouns; see above, pp. 217f.

[650]On $yaqtulu$ at Amarna, see Moran, "Byblos," especially pp. 39ff.

[651]The dur. form $ú$-$šàm$-ra-$ęú$-$šu$-nu-ti *6:3:27, probably has a sg. subject, and so perhaps the $-u$ is that of Ugaritic *$yaqtulu$; but there are other possibilities; see p.242, n. 295.

cult assumption that the U scribes knew that the Akk. pret. had no final vowel, but nevertheless sometimes forgot that it was a perfective, past form, and equated it with their own imperfective *yaqtulu.

b. Durative.

The dur., in both main and subordinate clauses, generally expresses action occurring over an extended period of time. In assertions, the tense value is often future; one example from the many will illustrate: *ina niṣṣat libbīša bīt abīša tū-šab* "She will live in her father's house in her misery" 3:56:24f. Occasionally, the present is meant: *gabba ša i-ba-aš-ši ana FN u ša i-ba-aš-ši ana PN* "everything that belongs to FN and that belongs to PN" 5:173:14f.; cf. *l.*21; 3:57:20.[652] Durative action in the past can also be described: e.g., *u lā i-ma-gàr ana tamīšu*[653] "but he would not agree to swear" 6:52b:6f.; *kunukka meher kunuk šarri rabî ītepšū u tuppāti sarrūti ina libbi GN i-ša-aṭ-ṭū-ru* "They made a seal, a copy of the great royal real, and were writing false documents in GN" 3:97:16ff.[654]

---

[652]Perhaps also *enūma kî ū-še-bal šarru bēl(u)ya sisî ana ardīšu* "whenever the king my lord sends horses to his servant" 5:98:9f. The following context is broken, however, and it is possible that *ušebbal* is a habitual past: "whenever he would send."

[653]The text has *ID-mi-šu*; see above, p. 260, n. 368.

[654]Here probably belong the past dur. forms of *alāku* in 5:87: *anumma eleppētu ša nakrî il-la!-ka* "now, the enemies' ships have been coming" *ll.*12f; *inanna ? eleppētu ša nakrî ša il-la-ka-an-ni* "Now then, the enemies' ships which have been coming against me are seven" *ll.*27ff.; see pp. 231f.

As elsewhere in Akk., the dur. often connotes moods other than simple assertion: e.g., potentiality: ...*i*]*qb*[*i*](?) *pīqat* [*aballuṭ*(?) *u*(?)] *pīqat a-ma-at* "...said(?): perhaps I would live(?) and(?) perhaps I would die" *6:3:10f.; permission: *ina ūmī balāṭīšu i-kal* "He may use it (all) the days of his life" 3:92:13f., and often; obligation:[655] *20 kaspa ina šattīšu up-pal*[656] "He is to pay 20 silver per year" 3:135:13, and often.

The notion of potentiality is, of course, present in the protases of conditional sentences, and there the dur. is the normal tense: e.g., *šumma urram šēram PN₁ i-zê-'-er PN₂ mārēu* "if in future PN1 rejects PN2 as his son" 3:55:7ff., and often.[657] The normal tense of the apodosis too is the dur., and usually permission or obligation is implied: e.g., the apodosis of 3:55:7ff., just given: *100 kaspa ana qātēu i-na-an-din* "he must give him 100 silver."[658] Since the notion of obligation is very close to that of injunction, it is not surprising to find the prec. or imper. in the apodosis, as occasionally in K as well (see above, p. 132); these are discussed below (section c).

Also related to the injunctive mood, is the regular use

_____

[655]The sense seems to be less forceful than the prec., for which, see below, section c.

[656]I take the verb in this passage, and the others like it, to be *uppulu* rather than *(w)abālu*; see above, pp. 250f.

[657]Other references are cited above, p. 348, n. 639.

[658]Other references are cited above, p. 347, n. 638.

of the dur. in negative commands. Two of the many examples
will suffice to illustrate this use: *lā ta-šak-kán* "do not
place" *3:19:22; *mamman lā i-leq-qè-šu* "no one may take it"
3:64a:8, and *p*.

It was noted above (section a), that the pret. sporadi-
cally (and incorrectly) replaces the dur. in all of these
conditions, so far mentioned, in which the dur. is the nor-
mal tense in U.

In one text, the dur. expresses purpose:[659] *inanna*
anumma 1600 šiltāha[660] [erî] *ina qāti PN atta[din] ana muhhi*
šarri bēlîya i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti "Now I hereby give PN 1600
copper arrowheads, that he may take them (or: to take) to
the king my lord" *3:5:12ff.; cf. 21ff.

In 3:68:8ff., the dur. is used for a punctual past
tense, after a pret.: *u PN idūkšu u inaddin GN ana šarri*
bēlîšu "PN killed him, and gave GN (back) to the king his
lord." I can find no explanation for this; the second clause
does not describe the circumstances during which the action
of the first occurred, but rather an event subsequent to it.
Nor does a purpose clause seem plausible. Note that, with
u, the clauses resemble the situation in which a converted

---

[659]See above, p. 152, for a similar instance in K.

[660]*šiltāha erî* is written ^{GI}KAK.KUM.TAG.GA URUDU.MEŠ in
ℓ.11; in ℓ.13, the last two signs are broken off. For the
reading *šiltāhu*, cf. *AHw*, 1236b; Nougayrol read it *mulmullu*,
which is equally possible. The same logogram recurs in 6:
104b:*p*.(a list), and there Nougayrol renders it *ūṣu*, another
word for arrow, and also a possibility. Note that the logo-
gram is usually KAK.(U₄.)TAG.GA, according to *AHw*, 1236b.

imperfect could arise in WS.[661]

c. Imperative and Precative.

As in K, these forms are used correctly. Examples of
both were given above, pp. 226f., 232f. All first and
third person injunctives are expressed by the prec.; there
is no evidence of a non-negative, jussive *iprus(a)* (i.e.,
Ugaritic *yaqtul(a)*).[662] The prec. usually expresses a wish:
e.g., *ilānu šumšu lihalliq* "may the gods destroy his name"
3:105:57; *u bēl(u)ya ana pani šarri bēliya liqbi* "and may
my lord speak before the king my lord" 5:98:r8'f. Less of-
ten, it indicates more specifically an indirect command:[663]
e.g., *amīlū annûtu lillikūni [a]na bīt ili līrubū* "Let these
men come (and) enter the temple" *5:142:28f. Note that this
last example is in fact the apodosis of a conditional sen-
tence. Often in that situation, a dur. occurs, indicating
obligation ("should, must"),[664] and thus a notion similar to
that expressed by the prec., but probably with less force.[665]

---

[661]Perhaps the form is a scribal error, and should be
emended to a pret.: *i-<<na->>din*.

[662]Several examples of the pret. (=*yaqtul*?) with a
negative, for the prohibitive, occur, however; see pp. 345ff.

[663]The line between "wish" and "indirect command" is
very vague, of course; and the Akk. prec., indeed, the jus-
sive throughout the Semitic languages, does not distinguish
between those nuances at all. On translating according to
context, cf. *GAG* §81d.

[664]See above, 352f.

[665]Once, an imper. is used in an apodosis: *inanna šumma*
eleppētu ša nakrī šanāt[u] ibašši tēma [ayy]ikām-ma šupr[a]nni
"Now if other ships of the enemy are present, send me word
somehow(?)" 5:88:32ff.

Finally, in several instances, the prec., after an imper. or another prec., denotes purpose: e.g., *šupra[m-mi/a] dīna ša alpī[ka] lugammir-mi*[666] *inanna dīna šāš[u]*[667] *gummir alpīya literrūninni* " 'Send the case concerning your oxen to me that I may complete (it).' Now then, complete that case that my oxen be returned to me" *5:142:12ff.

d. Stative.[668]

With adjectival verbs, the stative predicates the quality or attribute conveyed by the root: e.g., *[a]nāk[u](?) marṣāku danniš* "I was/have been very ill" *6:3:9; *šunu sarrū* "They are deceitful (i.e., liars)" 3:98:24; *rapiš* "It is wide" 5:8:8; *bani akanna ana pa<nī>ka kī yānu karānū...* "Does it seem right to you like this, that there are no vineyards?" *5:146:13.

The stative of active intransitive verbs describes the condition resulting from the action which the root signifies. With both of these categories of verbs, but especially with the latter, there is a semantic overlap in the meanings of the prefix-conjugations and the stative (e.g., *ūšib* "he sat down=he became seated"; *ašib* "he is seated").[669] Thus, it

---

[666]On this reading, see above, p. 233, n. 252.

[667]For this form, see above, p. 203, n. 138.

[668]On the treatment of the stative in this study, see the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

[669]Pointed out by Prof. T.O. Lambdin in a class, at Harvard University, on comparative Semitic philology.

is not surprising that some verbs are attested in both pre-
fix-conjugation and stative forms, with little, if any dif-
ference in meaning. This is the case with four verbs in U.
In two cases, the choice of the dur. rather than the stative
may have been to indicate more clearly the future tense:
inūma naker PN₁ tupšarru itti šarri bēltšu u PN₂ idūkšu
"When PN₁ the scribe was at war with the king his lord, PN₂
killed him" 3:68:7ff., but *šantta assurrim [šar GN(?)] it-*
tłya inakker "Moreover perhaps the king of GN(?) will be at
war with me" *EA*45:20f.; *gabbu ṣābū ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u*
gabba e[lepp]ētūya ina GN₂ ašbū "All my ...-troops are si-
tuated in GN₁ and all my ships are situated in GN₂" 5:87:20ff.,
but *ina nissat libbtša bīt abtša tuššab* "She will live in her
misery in her father's house" 3:56:24f. In an economic
docket listing individuals with bad credit, however, we find:
PN₁ GN₁ uššab PN₂ GN₂ uššab "PN₁: lives in GN₁; PN₂: lives
in GN₂" 6:74:5f.; cf. 6:75f.:p. In these texts, there is no
difference between *uššab* and *ašbū* in 5:87. In other cases,
no obvious reason for the choice of a pret. or perf. rather
than a stative (or vice versa) presents itself: *šumma...*
anāku mītāku "if...I should die" 3:76a:4f., but *šumma PN*
imūt "if PN should die" 5:5:7'; *šantta PN ana šarri anih*
"Moreover PN has been loyal to the king" 3:84:24; cf. 3:141:
29f., but *ana muhhi šarri bēltšu PN ētanah* 3:108:15f.; cf.
3:110a:7.

   The stative of active transitive verbs also usually

predicates the condition resulting from the action of the
verb in question. But it is therefore normally passive:
e.g., *u mātum kâm-ma nadât* "and the land is/could be/might
be overthrown in this way" 5:87:25; *eqelšu karānšu...gabbu
mimmi šumšīšu nadin ana PN* "His field, vineyard,..., every-
thing of his is given to PN" 3:68:4ff.

Some statives of active transitive verbs have a special
active meaning, however. This is especially true of verbs
denoting holding and acquisition.[670] One verb that is often
active in the stative is *našû*,[671] and there is one such exam-
ple in U: [... *qadᵓu(?) kaspi ša n[a]šî PN* "...along with(?)
the silver which PN holds" 5:176f.:12; but note that the
dur. *inašši* occurs in the same text (l.5; context broken).
Another verb that frequently occurs as an active stative is
hašāhu.[672] It is attested in only one text in U, in the pro-
tasis of two successive unmarked conditional sentences, in
3:53:11ff., quoted above, p. 330.

There are several other active statives in U, however,
which, if they occur at all, are very rare elsewhere in Akk.
One is the D verb *summuhu*. Normally, this means "to combine,
mix, alloy"; but at Nuzi, it means "to give (someone: acc.) a
portion" in the prefix-conjugations. In both Nuzi and U.

[670] Cf. M.B. Rowton, *JNES* 21, 233ff. (especially 239f.,
243ff., 266ff.).

[671] Ibid., 245 (no.'s 63-7), and *p*.

[672] Cf. the examples in *CAD*, s.v. Rowton, op. cit. (above,
n. 670), does not list any examples of *hašāhu*.

Akk., the stative means "to have a portion, share in
(*ina*)."[673] Perhaps the transformation developed as fol-
lows: originally, "to combine" perhaps came to mean "to
link," or even "to associate"; "to associate someone with
(*ina*) something" could be further extended to mean "to allot
someone (acc.) something (*ina* or acc.)." The stative mean-
ing in U and at Nuzi would thus be the passive of this:
"to be allotted something (*ina* or acc.)." The best pre-
served of the five attestations is: *lā summuh ina eqli annî*
"He may have no share in this field" 3:114:28.[674]

     The stative of *nadānu* is also active in a small number
of texts: e.g., *PN₁ GN-īyu 10 šiqla kaspi ina libbīšu ana
PN₂ 5 šiqla ana PN₃ nadin* "PN₁ the GN-ite gave 10 shekels
of silver agreeably(?) to PN₂, 5 shekels to PN₃" 6:108:4ff.
(Ec.); cf. 6:92a:9ff. (cf. the example with passive *nadin*,
3:68:4ff., quoted above). Since active statives of *nadānu*
are extremely rare in native Akk.,[675] perhaps we should see
here a reflection of the WS perfect.

     The verb *ṣamātu* occurs only in the stative, and essen-
tially only in one type of text: legal dockets describing
the turnover of property from one person to another;[676] e.g.,

_____

[673]See *AHw*, 1017a, s.v.; the Nuzi and U forms are cited
in mng 6.

[674]The other occurrences are 3:137b:7'; 5:4:9'ff.; 5:
5:4'; 3:58a:7f. (with *šummuh*).

[675]Rowton, op. cit. (above, n. 670), cites only three
instances, in no.'s 429 and 430, p. 293.

[676]See the discussion in *CAD* Ṣ, 94b.

karānu ṣamit ana PN u ana mārtŠu ad-dārīti "The vineyard is

transferred to PN and to his sons forever" 3:35a:7ff. Since

it is found only in U, it is presumably a Ugaritic word.

But it does not occur in any of the Ugaritic texts published

to date. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether *ṣamit/*

ṣamat represents the passive of a verb that is active in

Ugaritic (*ṣamata* [677] "he transferred"), or whether *ṣamata*

is an adjectival, or active intransitive, verb ("it (the es-

tate, etc.) passed over/changed hands (to someone)").

It was suggested in an earlier section (pp. 234f.) that

ṣamat[a] in 3:52a:16, statives with final *-a* rather

than *-u* may represent WS perfects (i.e., *qatala*), formally

at least, instead of the ventive.

The stative, since it is essentially a predicative ver-

bal adjective,[678] conveys no specific temporal nuance. How-

ever, apart from those that occur in protases, none of the

forms refer to the future. To express an injunctive of a

stative, *lū* is used: e.g., *lū ṣakū* "may they be free (of

claims)" *5:142:30.

11. *The Construction of the Infinitive*

Most of the infinitives in U function as nouns only:

e.g., *na-da-nu* "gift" 3:157a:15'; cf. *na-da-na* 3:118:21;

---

[677]Presumably with *a* rather than *i* as thematic vowel,
on the basis of forms written *ṣa-ma-at*. See above, 234f.

[678]Cf. G. Buccellati, *JNES* 27, 1ff.

na-da-an-ša 3:65a:20,27; *urubānū ša na-ba-ti-⌈šu⌉ -n⌜u⌝*

"the guarantors of (i.e., against) their flight" 3:37b:7f.;

eqlēt ha-ba-li-ma "fields of/for indebtedness(?)"[679] 3:46:
8.[680]

In the following example, the infinitive is in construct
to an objective genitive, and dependent on the preposition
ana:[681] *anumma PN mār-šiprīni ana ša-a-li*[682] *šulmi ša šarri*
bēlīni naltaparšu "We hereby send PN our messenger to inquire
after the welfare of the king our lord" 4:294:8ff. Another
instance, after *aššum*,[683] may involve the same construction:
PN iš'am 5 pu⌜rīda eqli⌝ aššum e-pê-ši[682] *u r⌜a-ṣa-pí(?)*[684]⌝
bīt : kunahi ša DN "PN bought 5 p.'s of field in order to

---

[679]The meaning of this term in this passage remains ob-
scure; cf. Nougayrol's comments in *PRU* 3, 46, n. 1.

[680]Note also, in the very poorly written text 5:145f.,
ana ú-ri-di-ia, presumably for *ana arādīya* "for my descent"
*l.*12. P.-R. Berger's suggestion (*UF* 2, 291), that the form
has "'assyrischer Lautbestand' mit Imāla" (i.e., *u-* from *wa-*,
and an unexplained *a→e* in the second syllable), is interesting,
but less likely than the assumption that this scribe simply
knew almost no Akk. beyond a few basic formulas.

[681]Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 183ff. The con-
struction is quite rare in MB; cf. ibid., 185.

[682]The case-ending on the bound form is normal in U;
see above, pp. 220f.

[683]Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 273ff. Most of
the examples there are from OB Mari, and none are given for
MB.

[684]The copy has only ⌐⌐; Nougayrol strangely ignores
this, and translates as if *u* were the last sign in the line:
"⌜PN⌝ achète...en vue de bâtir, mais(?) la maison *kunahi* est
à ⌜DN⌝." Our suggested restoration is merely a guess, of
course, but cf. 3:112b:9; 3:125:12; 3:137:9, in which repair-
ing (*raṣāpu*) an estate is a condition of the transactions.
P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1, 12, suggests *n⌜a-ṣa-ri⌝*.

(re)build and repair(??) the *k.*-house of DN" 5:8f.:17ff.

Since the case of *bīt*(É) cannot be determined, however, it
is also possible that it is acc., as the direct object of
the verbs.[685] (In native Akk., where the main verb stands
at the end of the clause, such a construction would be *aššum
bīt k. epēši*[686]) Still another example, after *ana*, has an
objective pronominal suffix:[687] *u lā imaggar ana tal(ID)-
mi-šu*[688] "but he would not agree to swear it (the oath)" 6:52:

6. It is possible that the suffix is subjective, i.e.,

"...to his swearing," but this seems less likely.[689]

In two economic texts, infinitives occur after *ana*
without a subject or object expressed.[690] In one, the
infinitive is probably a WS word: *...qāt PN nadin ana ma-
ka-ri*[691] "...was given to PN to sell" 6:119a:5f. The other

---

[685]In 5:20:1ff.(Ec.), the case of the following noun
again cannot be discerned: *100 kaspu aššum le-qè-e* SIGZA.GÌN
ana qāti PN "100 silver for acquiring *uqnû*-wool for(?) PN."
Another example occurs in a damaged text: *ana la-qe-e ṣi-x⌈
"to take..." 5:81:12.

[686]Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 269ff.

[687]Cf. ibid., 205ff.; the MB examples are on p. 207.

[688]The emendation is discussed above, p. 260, n. 368.

[689]Such is the case with ⌈*ana t*⌉*ummîšu* in the K text
6:36:14; see p. 155. Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*,
200ff. (MB on p. 202).

[690]Cf. ibid., 128ff.

[691]*makāru* meaning "to do business" appears only in OA;
cf. *CAD* M/1, 126f. *mkr* is attested as a verb in Ugaritic;
cf. *UT* §1477, p. 433. However, since the next example, also
from an Ec. text, is perhaps Ass., perhaps the OA verb is
what appears here.

short text appears to be pure Ass.: *21 URUDU.MEŠ x (x) x*

BI SU a-na e-pa-še ta-din a-na PN₁ DUMU *PN₂*[692] "21 copper...

for building was given to PN₁ son of PN₂" 6:110a.[693]

12. *The Syntax of the Accusative Case*

a. General.

Very few clauses are attested in which the verb takes

a double acc.: *PN₁ itti PN₂...eqel PN₃...pūhata īpuš* "PN₁

exchanged the field of PN₃...with PN₂..." 3:45b:4ff.; cf.

amat mašikta ītepšūnāši "They did an evil thing to us" 5:87f.:

30f.; *lišebbūki šībūta* "May they sate you with long life" 5:

148:10; *PN 100 hurāṣa šarra bēlšu uktabbit* "PN honored the

king his lord with 100 gold" 3:109a:10ff.; cf. also 3:55:6,

quoted below. With *ekēmu*, which usually takes a double acc.[694]

---

[692]Nougayrol reads the first two lines: *21 erâ*ᴹ *amat(?)*
ᴵ*ib-bi-su a-na e-pa-še ta-din* "21 (sicles de) cuivre (que)
la servante de Ibbisu a livrés pour façonnage." It seems
unlikely, however, that a "servante" would have the autho-
rity to dispense her master's property. Further the sign
in question is not GEME₂. Since *epāše* is an Ass. form, I
would suggest that *ta-dín* is the Ass. stative (*tadin*; cf.
GAG §102m, and the forms listed in Hecker, *GKT*, 173; no
statives of *n/tadānu* are listed for MA in Mayer, *UGMa*,
93f.). After *21 URUDU.MEŠ*, we read ⸢x⸣ ⸢x⸣ *BI SU*. Per-
haps we sould read *el!-lu! pé-ṣuₓ* "pure white"; *ellu* is
not attested with *erû*, but does describe other metals (sil-
ver and gold; cf. *CAD* E, 103a); *peṣû* occurs once with *erû*
(cf. *CAD* E, 322a); however, in Ass., *paṣiu* is expected (cf.
AHw, 857a). A less likely possibility is to read *21 erû*
el!-lu! kás-su ana epāše "21 pure copper to make/do X(?),"
and compare this with *qa-ṣu-ma epēšu*, attested twice at Nuzi
and as yet not understood; cf. *CAD* K, 311a.

[693]The form *la-lak* 6:74:4(Ec.) is more likely for *lā
allak* (1s dur.) than an infinitive (*lā alāk*) in the absolute
state; cf. A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 41.

[694]Cf. *GAG* §145e, and the examples in the dictionaries.

the second object is replaced by a prepositional phrase

with *ištu*, on the analogy of the far more frequently used

leqû: e.g., *mamman ištu qāti PN...ul ekkimšu* "No one may

take it from PN" 3:67:13f.

The acc. is occasionally used adverbially.[695] The in-

definite pronoun *mimmam* may be an acc. of respect in [m]im-

mam eli FN...[lā] ittazzamūni "They must not complain at

all against FN..." 3:66a:6ff.; it may be the direct object,

however ("may not complain about anything"). As in K, an

acc. of time ("when") is the ubiquitous *urra(m) šēra(m)*[696]

"in future." An acc. of place ("where") is *bīt abīša tuš-*

šab "she will live in her father's house" 3:56:25, replacing

ina plus the gen. In some economic texts, a number of verbs

seem to govern an acc. of place rather than an expecred pre-

positional phrase; perhaps these are for the sake of brevity:[697]

note, e.g., both *PN ina GN uššab* and *PN GN uššab* for "PN:

lives in GN" in 6:75:*p.*; cf. 6:74:5,6(both acc.). In the

last text, there occurs also *PN ša taba''û*[698] *GN* "PN who is

sought in GN" in *ll.*1f.

Other acc.'s are used sporadically in lieu of other

prepositional phrases: e.g., *PN₁...irtakus PN₂...ana mārū-*

---

[695]Cf. *GAG* §§146,147.

[696]Cf. *PRU* 3, 230, s.v.

[697]Even a dative becomes an acc., with the omission of *ana*: ...*5 subātu 2000 uqnû qāti PN nadin ana makāri* "...5 garments, 2000(-weight of) *u.*-wool is given to PN to sell" 6:119a.

[698]See above, pp.320f.

tīšu mārūt ammati[699] *irkuššu* "PN$_1$...bound PN$_2$...in adoptive

sonship; in a sonship of ... he bound him" 3:55:4ff.; in the

second clause, the acc. replaces the *ana* plus gen. of the

first. Note also *FN kasap terhatīša...zakât* "FN is free (of

claims) regarding the silver of her bride-price" 3:56:21ff.,

where the acc. is used instead of the usual *ištu* plus gen.[700]

The notion of intent is usually expressed by a phrase with

ana: e.g., *u PN$_1$ ittaši eqelšu...u iddinšu ana šarrati ana*

pūhat eqel/eqlēt PN$_2$ "PN took his field...and gave it to the

queen as a substitute for PN$_2$'s field(s)" 3:50b:5ff.; cf. 3:

78:12f.; 3:49b:13. In one text, however, the same notion is

expressed by an acc. in apposition to the object of the pre-

vious clause (left unexpressed in its own clause): *u ittaši*

bīta eqlēti u ittadin ana PN...pūha bītīšu u eqlīšu "He took

the house (and) fields and gave (them) to PN as a substitute

for his own house and field" 6:27:5'ff.

　　Finally, the ordinals *ištēn*[701] "first" and *šanû* "second"

are used adverbially in the acc. for "firstly, in the first

place," and "secondly, in the second place": e.g., *ištēn PN*

iddinšu u šanâm RN...iddinšu "Firstly, PN gave it, and se-

condly, RN...gave it" 3:87f.:rl2'ff. Often, *ištēn* has the

suffix *-šu*, which is frequently attached to numerical ad-

_____

　　[699]The meaning of this word is unknown.

　　[700]See above, p. 266.

　　[701]*ištēn* is of course the cardinal number "one." How-
ever, it is also often used ordinally, replacing the poorly
attested *ištiyû*; cf. *GAG* §70a; *CAD* I/J, 278a (*ištēn* 3).

verbs in Akk.[702] It is attached to "secondly" only in the

prepositional-phrase equivalent of *šanâ(m)*: *ina šantšu*,

e.g., in 3:46:19. In addition to *šanâm* (often with -*ma*[703])

and *ina šantšu* for "secondly," there also occurs the f.

šantta, e.g., in 3:50b:11. This last is of course extremely

common throughout Akk. as an adverbial acc. introducing new

paragraphs, its meaning weakened to "moreover."[704] Besides

ištēn(šu), there also occurs once *ittīlta* (3:167:14), the

derivation of which is obscure.[705]

b. The Resumptive Accusative Suffix.

Resumptive acc. suffixes are somewhat more frequent in

U than in K, but they are still not a common feature. As in

K, the suffix refers to the word or phrase that is the direct

object of the verb to which the suffix is attached. Normally,

they are found in main clauses: e.g., [u bēl(u)]ya PN [ana

p]anī šarri bēltya lušēribš[u] "May my lord have PN enter

before the king my lord" 5:98:r3'f. Once, the feature is

found within a relative clause: *ša PN...ištu ahīya ša*[706]

---

[702]Cf. *GAG* §71a,b. *CAD* I/J, 284, under *ištššu*, labels
the form simply as an adverb.

[703]The -*ma* does not alter the meaning, except perhaps
to emphasize the distinction between the two acts; see above,
pp. 322ff.

[704]It is especially common in WPA; cf. *AHw*, 1164.

[705]Cf. *GAG* §71b, Anm.; *CAD* I/J, 282f.

[706]On the extra *ša*, see above, p. 335; it seems impro-
bable that this is related to the occurrence of the resump-
tive suffix.

īhuššī "whoever takes FN...from my brother (in marriage)"
3:76a:6ff. There is only one instance in which the relative
pronoun *ša*, serving as the direct object of its clause, is
resumed by an acc. suffix: 3:90b:10f., quoted above, p.
334. In contrast, note, e.g., *terhatīša ša talteqe* "the
silver of her bride-price, which she took" 3:56:21. With
but one exception, the object to which the suffix refers al-
ways precedes its verb; the exception is: *u uzakkīšu šarru*
PN "And the king freed PN (of claims)" 3:153f.:13f.

Unlike K, where the resumptive suffix refers only to
persons, in U it may refer to any object: e.g., *RN...bīta*
u eqlēti ša PN₁ ina GN ana PN₂ ittadinšunu "RN...has given
PN₁'s estate and fields in GN to PN₂" 3:89b:2ff.; cf. 3:90b:
10f. As the examples thus far quoted show, the resumptive
pronoun usually agrees with its referent in gender and num-
ber. Exceptions are infrequent; note, e.g., *u PN bīt GN₁...*
u eqel GN₂ ittašīšu "PN has taken the estate of GN₁...and
the field of GN₂" 3:85:7ff.; cf. 3:102ff.13f.

The distance between the object and the verb with the
suffix varies considerably; for contrast, note, e.g., *u*
bēl(u)ya PN kī damqi kī ṭābi ana pani šarri bēlīšu qarr[ib]šu
"May my lord present PN well and properly before the king his
lord" *3:5:26ff.; and *u mārīšu unammaršunu*[707] "and he will
... his sons" 3:82:13.[708] Thus, the distance of the object

---

[707]The meaning of this verb is obscure here; cf. pp.
245f., n. 308.

[708]Cf. also: *u eq[la](?)ilaqqēšu* "and he will take the
field(?)" 3:52a:24f.

from its verb is not a criterion for employing a resumptive suffix. Nor is emphasis on the object;[709] most of the examples can be paralleled by others *without* the resumptive pronoun, e.g., immediately before the last example: *šanīta PN zittašunu ana ekalli ušerreb* "Moreover, PN will deliver their shares into the palace" 3:82:16f. (vs., e.g., 5:98:r3'f., above); *RN...GN qadu gabbi mimmi šumētša iddin ana PN* 3:146b: 2ff. (vs., e.g., 3:89b:2ff., above); etc. No other formal criterion for the use of a resumptive suffix in such cases presents itself.

In a few instances, it is possible that the words or phrases which are resumed by suffixes, and which we have been calling the direct object of the verbs on which they occur, are instead examples of casus pendens. This possibility is especially attractive when the proposed "object" is in the nom.[710] An example might be: *šanīta bītu(É-tu₄) eqlētu ša PN₁ ina GN₁ana PN₂ šarru iddinšu*, 3:102ff.:38f., which would then be translated: "Moreover, as for PN₁'s estate and fields in GN--the king gave them (lit.: it) to PN₂." There are, however, a number of strong arguments against such an interpretation. First, there are many incorrect case-endings in U,[711] and so, that should not receive the highest priority in determining the syntax. Secondly, in the same text as our

---

[709]As in generally the case in native Akk.; cf. *GAG* §130h.

[710]Cf. the example in *GAG* §128c(γ).

[711]See above, pp. 217f.

example, and elsewhere (as noted above), there occur parallel clauses without resumptive suffixes, and in which, therefore, the parallel words or phrases *must* be direct objects of the following verbs--even when those words or phrases are (incorrectly) nom.; note, e.g., several lines before our example: *šanītta bītu(É-tu₄) eqlu ša PN₃ ina libbi GN₂ ana PN₂ iddin šarru*[712] *ll.*29f. Finally, whenever the subject of the verb occurs before the word or phrase under consideration, as happens more often than not,[713] there can be no question of a casus pendens; the word or phrase *must* be the direct object. Thus, if the above interpretation were valid, any word or phrase *not* preceded by the subject of the following verb would be labelled a casus pendens, but those that *are* preceded by a subject would be labelled direct objects. This is a very unlikely distinction.

There is, however, one small group of examples which, as in K, may nevertheless be casus pendentes, namely, those in which a relative clause is resumed by a pronominal suffix. There are only two of these, and in both cases it is impossible to determine whether the clause is to be considered the direct object of the verb, or a casus pendens, outside the

---

[712]It is extremely unlikely that the order of subject and verb in these passages is significant. As a third example from the same text, note: *šanītta eqlēt PN₄...ina GN₂ ana PN₂ šarru iddin ll.*35f.

[713]E.g., still in the same text, note: *u PN₂ 500 kaspa (KÙ.BABBAR-pa) ana šarri iddinšu* "And PN₂ gave the king 500 silver" *l.*31.

main clause: *ša ušbalkit nidna annâ DN...liš'alšu* "May DN

...hold responsible (lit.: ask) whoever overturns this gift"

or "As for whoever overturns this gift--may DN...hold him

responsible" 3:84:25ff.; *ša FN...ištu ahīya ša ihuzši DN*

lirahhišu "May DN inundate whoever takes FN...(in marriage)

from my brother" or "As for whoever takes...--may DN inundate

him" 3:76a:6ff.[714]

13. *Incomplete and Interrupted Grammar*

a. Ellipsis.

The verb *paṭāru* is normally active-transitive, meaning

"to loosen, remove, redeem, etc.": *u ipturšu ištu aškāpūti*

"He removed him from the leatherworkers" 3:78:8f.; cf. also

6:44:4f. With ellipsis of the object, however, the verb

means "to depart":[715] e.g., *u tapaṭṭar ana sūqi* "She will

depart into the street" 3:60b:15; cf. 3:65:22; 3:75a:11,16;

3:82:27; *5:137:27.

---

[714]In a similar passage (3:105:56f.), the relative
clause *must* be a casus pendens, since it represents a gen.
dependent on a noun; see below, p. 371.

[715]Cf. *GAG* §184d; *AHw*, 850 (*paṭāru*, mng. 14). The verb
w/mu''uru "to command" is also normally active-transitive:
e.g., *FN [...] gabba tuma''er* "FN...will control everything"
3:172b:5. But it occurs without an object in 3:81:32. This
is not an instance of ellipsis, however; the normal construc-
tion, with a direct object, is replaced by *eli*: *akil narkabti
lā uma''er eli PN u eli mārīšu* "The overseer of the chariotry
may have no power over PN and his sons." The construction
with *eli* is apparently due to an equation, in the mind of the
scribe, of *w/mu''uru* with WS *malaka*, which was intransitive,
for note the parallel sentence: *hazannu āli u akil eqlēti lā
imallik elīšu* "The town mayor and the overseer of the fields
may have no power over him" 3:135a:15f. That the usage is
Ugaritic is proven by *aḥdy . dymlk . ᶜl . ilm* "It will be I
alone who rule over the gods" *UT* 51:7:49f., p. 173.

The following, syntactically difficult, passage is per-
haps a result of ellipsis: *u PN ušērib 1000 kaspa u 3 bilta
siparri 4 amta...[X]paššūra ša ušērib PN ana bīti FN* "And PN
brought 1000 silver, 3 talents of bronze, 4 maidservants...
etc., X tables; what PN brought into FN's house" 5:173:6ff.
What occurs after the list is not a complete sentence; it is
a relative clause which neither modifies a noun nor serves
as any other part of speech in a larger main clause.[716] It
seems that a subject, for which the clause would serve as
predicate, has been omitted, for instance *annû* or *amātu an-
nātu*: "(This/these things are) what PN brought..."

As noted in the previous chapter (p. 160), von Soden
considers certain phrases beginning with *aššum* to be cases
of ellipsis.[717] Two such examples occur in U: *bēlī aššum
dīni ša PN kī tašpura...inanna...altakan* "My lord, concerning
the case of PN (I am writing): since you wrote...I have now
established..." 3:4:9ff.; and *aššum alpīya ša iltarqū amīlū
GN kī taqtabi...inanna...gummir* "Concerning my oxen, which
the men of GN stole (I am writing): since you said...now then,
complete..." *5:141f.:7ff.

b.   There are no oaths quoted in these texts.

c. Parenthesis.[718]

A possible instance of this is: *RN...ilteqe bītāti*

---

[716]Cf. *GAG* §165e-j.   [717]*GAG* §184c.

[718]Cf. *GAG* §182.

*eqlēti ištu šarri ina kaspi ištēn ina kaspi u ša[nīt]a nidnu
bītāti eqlēti immerāti alpī maršītu ša PN* "RN(the crown
prince)...took estates and fields from the king in exchange
for silver--first, in exchange for silver, and secondly, as a
gift--(namely:) the estates, fields, sheep, oxen, the pro-
perty of PN" 3:102:1ff.

d. Casus Pendens.[719]

One example of a casus pendens is required by normal
Akk. grammar; since a relative clause in which the determi-
native pronoun may not stand in a genitive relationship,[720]
we have: *ša tuppu annâm unakker ilanu šumšu lihalliq* "As
for whoever alters this tablet, may the gods destroy his
name," for "...the name of whoever..." 3:105:56f. A simi-
lar, though not required, transformation has taken place in
the following: *u mannum-mê ina libbīšunu ša ukabbi[t] FN
ummašu ana šuwāti tanandin* "And as for either of them (of two
sons) who honors his mother FN, to him will she give" *Sy*18:
249f.:24ff. (for *ana mannim-mê...ša* "to either of them who..."),
Another example of casus pendens occurs in the same text: *u
anumma 2 mārūya PN₁ rabû u PN₂ ṣehru mannum-mê ina libbīšunu
ša izziz...umalli* "And now, as for my two sons, PN₁, the
elder, and PN₂, the younger--either of them who would stand
...will pay" ibid.:14ff. Note also *šanīta imēru ša illeqe!*

[719]*GAG* §128 ("zusammengesetzte Nominalsätze").

[720]*GAG* §165k.

ultu akanna inanna anumma PN...altapar imēra šâšu ana qāti PN...t[ē]r "As to the ass which was taken from here--I am hereby sending PN...; return that ass with PN" *6:12:11ff.

   After one instance of a casus pendens, the main clause commences with *u* (of apodosis), presumably a WS phenomenon:[721]

lū māru lū mārt[u ša] PN u lā išû[ni...] "As for any son or daughter of PN--they may not have (a share)..." 3:102:18f.

e.   There are no clear instances of anacoluthon in these texts.

---

[721]Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §176a,j, and the examples cited there, e.g., II Kings 16:14: *wǝ-'ēt pǝnê ham-mizbaḥ han-nǝḥōset 'ăšer li-pnê yhwh way-yaqrēb mē-'ēt pǝnê hab-bāyit* "As for the bronze altar which was before Yahweh, he removed (it) from in front of the house"; cf. I Kings 15:13; and also in the Mesha Stele: *ᶜmry . mlk . yšr'l . wyᶜnw . 't . m'b . ymn . rbn* "As for Omri, king of Israel, he oppressed Moab for many days" MI:4f. (H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, I, 3rd ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971), 33.

PART III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. *Summary*

What follows is a brief recapitualtion of the evidence
presented in Parts I and II, in the areas in which the two
dialects share features that differ from native Akk., and
in the areas in which K and U differ from each other. Only
these features are mentioned; they are presented in the same
order and with the same section numbers and letters under
which they appear in Parts I and II. Therefore, certain
sections, in which the features discussed above present no
peculiarities vis-à-vis native Akk. in either K or U, are
omitted below.

It must be remembered, when features are being com-
pared, that the K corpus is much smaller than the U corpus.
Therefore, certain features may be lacking in K simply by
coincidence. (However, the U corpus, especially in the le-
gal texts, is very repetitive, whereas the. K corpus is not.)

B.b. K: 21; U: 172ff.

In U, MEŠ and HI.A often follow grammatically sg.
nouns. In K, this is probably so with words for metals only.

B.c. K: 22; U; 175.

In U, only two verbs, both I-ʾ, have an extra initial

vowel-sign. In K, the number is larger, and the feature is not confined to verbs I-ʾ.

B.f. K: 24; U: 176.

In both dialects, a very small number of words contain an unexpected extra vowel-sign.

B.g. K: 24; U: 176f.

Only U exhibits any examples of incorrect broken writings.

B.h. K: 24ff.; U: 177ff.

In both, there is a substantial body of evidence which shows that *i* and *e* were never necessarily written distinctly, and, in fact, that they were probably not phonemically distinct.

B.i. K: 26; U: 184f.

In both, only a small percentage (about 15%) of the appropriate forms shows the change *uparris→uperris*.

B.j. K: 26; U: 185f.

ea and *ia* have become *â* in both dialects, with one exception in U.

B.k. K: 26; U: 186.

Initial *w* has been lost in both, but is written in one example in U; writings of intervocalic *w* are always *m* in K, but vacillate between *w* and *m* in U.

B.l. K: 26f.; U: 186ff.

In both, mimation has been lost, except when not final, and in a few archaizing/frozen forms.

B.m. K: 28; U: 188f.

In K, $\check{s}{\rightarrow}l$ always takes place, with the exception of *ištu* (always with $\check{s}$). In U, $\check{s}{\rightarrow}l$ usually, but not always takes place, and *ultu* occurs sporadically.

B.n. K: 28.; U: 189.

Only one example in each dialect shows the change: root-final dental/sibilant + -$\check{s}$ → -ss-.

B.o. K: 28f.; U: 189f.

In both, a small number of words indicate some confusion in the pronunciation or representation of s and $\check{s}$.

B.p. K: 29; U: 190.

Both show sporadic, but inconsistent, nasalization of double voiced stops. In K, the dur. of *nadānu* never (in five exx.) shows nasalization; in U, it usually (but not always) does.

C.1.a. K: 30; U: 191f.

U contains a number of dat. independent personal pronouns, while K has none; but the latter fact is probably coincidental.

C.1.b. K: 30; U: 192.

    attu- occurs twice in K, never in U.

C.1.c. K: 30ff.; U: 192ff. (genitive suffixes).

    In K, the 1s is always written with *-IA*. In U, this is true with the exception of a few (archaizing) vocative forms, which are (correctly) *-ī*, all in the letters.

    3ms in K is consistently *-šu* (except *aššassu*). In U, *amatēsu* occurs once, *nidnuš* once; otherwise always *-šu*.

    3fs in K is *-ša*, with one exception (*-ši*). U has *-ša* most often, but *-sa* frequently, and *-ši* twice.

    U has *-šina* for the only expected 3fp; K has *-šunu*, once.

C.1.d. K: 32f.; U: 196ff. (accusative suffixes).

    For 3fs, K always has *-ši*. U has *-ša* three times, *-ši* only once.

    For 3mp, K has *-šunūti*, except once *-šunu*. U has *-šunūti* in the letters, except twice *-šunu* on *nadānu*; but in legal texts, *-šunu* is used, with one (possibly two) exception(s).

C.1.e. K: 33f.; U: 199ff. (dative suffixes).

    For 1s, K always has *-a(m)/-ni(m)*, i.e., the ventive. In U, the acc. suffix occurs as often as the simple ventive for the dat.

    2ms is always *-akku/-nikku* (i.e., with the ventive) in both.

C.2.a. K: 34ff.; U: 202ff. (anaphoric pronoun).

For ms nom. *šū* and *šūt* occur in both; the oblique is always *šâšu* in K, but either *šâšu* or *šuwâti* in U.

The fs nom. is *šīt* (once) in U, not attested in K; the oblique is *šâši* in K, not attested in U.

The mp nom. is *šunu* in U, not attested in K; the oblique is either *šâšunu* or *šunūti* in K, not attested in U.

The 3fp (oblique) is replaced by the 3mp in K; not attested in U.

C.2.d. K: 37ff.; U: 205ff. (indefinite pronouns).

For the personal, K has only *mannum-mê* (once, with *ša*, as a general relative) and *mamma* (always in negative contexts). U also has *mannum-mê*, with and without *ša*, for the general relative, but *mamman*, *mamma*, *mannum-ma*, and *mannum--mê* all occur in negative contexts.

For the impersonal, K has *mīnum-mê* (used like *mannum--mê*) and *mimma* (like *mamma*). U has *mīnum-mê*, *mimma*, *mimmam*, and *mimmam-ma*.

mimmû in K is indeclinable, and occurs only with suffixes. In U, it is sometimes declined, and may occur without suffixes.

The form *ayyânum-ma* "anyone" occurs once in K, not in U.

C.2.e. K: 41f.; U: 212ff.

In both K and U, *gabbu* is sometimes declined, other times treated as an indeclinable form *gabba*.

C.3. K: 42ff.; U: 215ff. (noun and adjective).

Mistakes in case-endings in U tend to be the nom. re-
placing the gen. or acc. No such tendency is apparent in K.

The sg. bound form in K is generally according to nor-
mal Akk. rules. In U, however, the majority of sg. bound
forms have case-endings.

In U, the treatment of nouns after numerals and mea-
surements differs from normal Akk. In K, the evidence is
insufficient for any conclusions.

C.4.a. K: 51ff.; U: 226ff. (markers of person in verbs).

The 3fs prefix in K is the same as the 3ms, with the
exception of one text (t-). In U, it has t-, with very few
exceptions.

The 1p prefix in K is more often na- than ni-. In U,
the sole form has na-.

The are two probable 3mp verbs with t- prefix in U.
The K forms present no unusual features.

The 3fp is poorly attested and somewhat problematic
in both dialects.

The prec. in K exhibits no specifically Ass. features.
In U, most forms that exhibit a difference are Bab., but a
few Ass. forms occur, especially in the š.

The stative in K presents no problems (two D forms are
Ass.). A number of forms in U have incorrect theme vowels;
others may represent WS perfects.

C.4.b. K: 55ff.; U: 237ff.

The ventive is used correctly and consistently in letters in both K and U. It is rare in K legal texts. In K treaty texts and U legal texts, the ventive occurs with few exceptions only on pl. verbs, and probably does not function as the ventive in native Akk.; its occurrence in such cases is problematic.

C.4.c. K: 60ff.; U: 242f.

The subjunctive appears in K in over half of the examples where it is expected. In U, it occurs only once in the entire corpus.

C.4.d. K: 63ff.; U: 243ff. (derived conjugations).

The G in K presents no problems. In U, several roots have incorrect or variable theme vowels.

The Gtn is used more often in K than in U (where both possible forms are problematic).

On form in K (*nattak(k)ir*) may be a D with an incorrect prefix; otherwise in K, the D is usually correctly formed and used. In U, the D exhibits several peculiarities: it is rarely found in the dur., even when the dur. is expected; the perf. occurs only once; two or three forms have a G prefix; several D's in U are not attested or rare in the D elsewhere in Akk.

The Š and N present few problems in either dialect.

Apart from the Gtn, *t-* and *tan*-forms are rare in both.

C.4.e. K: 67ff.; U: 249ff. (weak verbs).

In verbs II-ʾ, the ʾ is frequently written or indicated by a broken writing in U. There are few examples in K.

Verbs III-weak in both dialects always show contraction of the final vowel and a vocalic suffix. In U, forms such as *ilaqqe* and *iqtebi* occur as well as *ileqqe* and *iqtabi*, perhaps due to internal analogical re-formations. In K, only the normal Bab. forms (*ileqqe*, *iqtabi*) are found.

C.5. K: 73ff.; U: 262ff. (prepositions).

eli does not occur in K, perhaps only by coincidence.

In both K and U, the range of meaning exhibited by *ištu* is considerably greater than it is in native Akk.; generally, it tends to replace *ina* in several nuances and idioms, perhaps due to WS influence. *ultu* is attested only in U.

The comparative preposition in K is *kī*. In U, it is *kīma*, and once *kīmê*, neither of which occurs in K.

lētu occurs once in a prepositional phrase in K, never in U.

mahru does not occur in prepositional phrases in either dialect.

In both K and U, *ana muhhi* occurs frequently to express motion toward or against someone.

In U, *qātu* occurs very frequently in prepositional phrases (*ana/ina/ištu qāti*). In K, it occurs as such only once.

C.6. K: 82ff.; U: 273ff. (adverbs).

Several adverbs are attested in U that do not occur
in K (e.g., *akanna* B, *ammaka*, *annaka*, *assurrim*), and vice
versa (e.g., *ahāmiš*, *mithāriš*); but comparisons are diffi-
cult because of the few attestations of each form, and the
smaller size of the K corpus.

The expression *inanna anumma* is common in U, unattes-
ted in K.

urram šēram always has mimation in K (six occurrences).
It usually has mimation in U, but often occurs without it.

The various expressions for "forever" attested in U
do not come up in K.

C.7. K: 87ff.; U: 281.

Enclitic *-mê* seems to have a broader range of use in
K than in U.

C.9. K: 91f.; U: 284ff.

There are very few certain Assyrianisms in either
dialect; for the most part they are pronominal and verbal
forms. The number in U is perhaps slightly higher, propor-
tionately, than the number in K.

D.1.a-b. K: 93ff.; U: 288ff.

Verbal clauses (including those with the stative) in
K are almost without exception verb-final. In U, there is
no fixed order; most often, the subject and object precede
the verb, while adverbial constituents follow the verb, al-

though many variations occur.

D.1.c. K: 95ff.; U: 296ff.

In nominal clauses, the order in both K and U is normally subject-predicate; there are more exceptions to this in U than in K. Several times in K, and once in U, there occur nominal clauses of the type *X Y šū* for "X is Y," a construction that is probably WS in origin.

D.2.b. K: 99ff.; U: 304ff.

In U, two bound forms are followed by *-ma*, as may happen with enclitic *m* in Ugaritic. The use of a bound form (as opposed to the unbound form and *ša*) is more common in U than in K. The construction *X-šu ša Y* for "the X of Y" occurs in both corpora, but is more common in U than in K. The construction *ša Y X-šu* for "the X of Y" occurs rarely in K, not at all in U.

D.3. K: 106ff.; U: 311ff. (agreement).

The letters in both groups are very consistent in exhibiting proper concord. The more formulaic legal and treaty texts contain more errors. A sg. subject with a pl. verb is very rare in both K and U; a pl. subject with a sg. verb is rare in K, but is common in U. There are more instances of lack of agreement between nouns and their adjectives in U than in K, but the phenomenon is rare in both. In U, pl. antecedents are frequently referred to by a sg. pronoun (e. g., *iddinšu* "he gave them(!)"); this does not occur in K.

D.5. K: 110ff.; U: 319ff. (negation).

In both dialects, *lā* occurs much more frequently than *ul*. In K, both negatives occur in main clauses and protases (none in other subordinate clauses); in U, both occur in main clauses, but only *lā* in protases, and in the sole subordinate clause. In prohibitions, K has only *(lū) lā*; U has *lā* or *ul*, although the latter is rare.

The particle of non-existence *yānu* is common in U, and occasionally has an "object" rather than a "subject" (e.g., *pilka yānu* "there is no feudal service"), probably due to WS influence. *yānu* is not attested in U.

The vetitive is not attested in either dialect.

D.6. K: 112f.; U: 321f.

lū is common in K, rare in U. In both, it serves to make injunctive both nominal clauses and the stative, and, when repeated in lists, means "whether...or." In K, it also transforms the dur. into an injunctive (three times), and strengthens *lā* in prohibitions (five times). It is not found with these uses in U, but there it occurs once as an asseverative particle.

D.7. K: 113ff.; U: 322ff.

Non-coordinating enclitic *-ma* is much more common in U than in K. It occurs even on verbs, rarely in K, often in U.

D.8. K: 117ff.; U: 325ff. (coordination of clauses).

To join clauses, -*ma* is used sporadically in K, very rarely in U; the occurrences in K conform in used to native Akk.; at least one of the (two or three) U examples does not.

The normal conjunction in both dialects is *u*. Many of the examples of its use are probably of WS origin.

-*ma u* occurs once in K, and is used as in OB. It appears several times in U, but the -*ma* probably does not have a connective force.

D.9.a. K: 129ff.; U: 330ff.

Unmarked conditional sentences are very rare in both K and U.

The normal tense in the protasis is the dur. in both dialects; in the apodosis, the dur. and prec. (rarely imper.) occur.

D.9.b. K: 134ff.; U: 332ff. (relative clauses).

Two examples of the *bīt īpušu* construction were suggested for K; none occurs in U.

Rarely in U, but never in K, *ša* is repeated (without purpose) in relative clauses.

D.9.c. K: 138ff.; U: 335ff.

In both dialects, other subordinate clauses are quite rare.

In K, the comparative conjunction, like the comparative

preposition, is *kī (ša); kīmê* is used for temporal clauses; *kīma* does not occur. In U, the comparative conjunction (and preposition) is *kīma; kī* occurs five times, twice in "that"-clauses, twice in clauses that are probably causal, and in one damaged context; *kīmê* is not attested.

In both groups, *undu* occurs, probably as a temporal conjunction.

In K, *enūma* seems to be a sentence-initial adverb rather than a conjunction. The evidence in U is less clear.

D.10.a. K: 141ff.; U: 341ff. (use of preterite and perfect).

In K letters, the normal past tense form in main clauses is the perf.; the pret. is more frequent in relative clauses. In K legal texts, the pret. is used for the "background" of a case, the perf. for the results of the judgment. In treaties, the perf. is not used. There are many exceptions to these observations, but, in general, the use of the pret. and perf. in K resembles that in MB.

In U, the pret. and perf. are often interchangeable, although there are a few observable tendencies: one or the other is always or usually used with certain verbs; the perf. is more frequent in the first clause in legal texts, and after *anumma* and *inanna*; sequences of clauses tend to have each verb in the same tense. There are many exceptions to each of these tendencies, however.

Also in U, the pret. often occurs where a dur. is expected, perhaps due to WS influence; the perf. is so used

only once. This feature is not found in K.

D.10.d. K: 153ff.; U: 355ff.

Active statives, which may occasionally reflect WS perfects, are more common in U than in K. In U, the stative is occasionally found in clauses paralleled by other clauses in which a prefix-conjugation form occurs.

D.12.b. K: 158f.; U: 365ff.

Resumptive acc. suffixes in main clauses occur sporadically in K, more often in U. In K, the referent is always a person, but in U, no such restriction exists. In neither dialect is the distance of the object from the verb, or emphasis of the object, a factor in the use or non-use of a resumptive suffix.

D.13. K: 159ff.; U: 369ff.

Examples of incomplete or interrupted grammar are infrequent in both corpora.

2. *Conclusion*

The above list shows that there are many differences between the Akk. dialect written at Carchemish and that written at Ugarit. Some of the differences are substantial, such as word order, use or non-use of the subjunctive, the 3fs prefix, the bound form of nouns, the use of the tenses.

The dialect of native Akk. that these two corpora resemble most closely is MB. Although both contain a sub-

stantial number of features that differ from MB, the K dia-
lect is much closer to the native language than the U dia-
lect is. Nearly all the deviations from MB that are found
in K also occur in U, some of them much more frequently.
And many additional aberrations are attested in U that do
not occur in K. An interesting sidelight, however, is that
the U texts exhibit a small number of OB features which do
not appear in K, such as initial and medial writings of *w*,
š before a dental, the use of *kīma* rather than *kī*.

It is clear, then, that we cannot speak of the grammar
of the texts found at Ras Shamra as a unit (or, for that
matter, of that of the texts found at El-Amarna, or Boghaz-
koy, etc.). Rather, the place of origin of a text, and its
genre, must be taken into account, and the text compared
with others of the same type, written in the same location;
only then may *dialects*, not individual texts, from different
regions be compared. When this methodology has been applied
to the other major text groups in the Ras Shamra corpus, it
may be possible to "place" at least some of the texts whose
region of origin has been heretofore unknowable. And only
when a sufficient number of dialects, in the Ras Shamra, El-
Amarna, and other archives, have been described, will the
study of western peripheral Akkadian be able to advance
considerably.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Hans-Peter. *Das Akkadische des Königs Tušratta von Mitanni*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1976.

Albright, William F. "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit," *BASOR* 95 (1944), 30ff.

Aro, Jussi. *Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1957.

_____. *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1961.

_____. Review of Jean Nougayrol, *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit, III*, *AfO* 18 (1957-58), 143ff.

_____. *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1955.

Berger, P.-R. "Die Alašia-Briefe Ugaritica 5, Noug. Nrn. 22-24," *UF* 1 (1969), 217ff.

_____. "Zu den 'akkadischen' Briefen Ugaritica V," *UF* 2 (1970), 285ff.

_____. "Zu den Wirtschafts- und Rechtsurkunden Ugaritica V," *UF* 1 (1969), 121ff.

Berkooz, Moshé. *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, 1937.

Bloch, S.J. "Beiträge zur Grammatik des Mittelbabylonischen," *OrNS* 9 (1940), 305ff.

Böhl, F.M.Th. *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909.

Buccellati, Giorgio. "An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence," *JNES* 27 (1968), 1ff.

Bush, Frederic W. "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language." Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1964.

Dhorme, E. "Lettre du roi de Kargamish au roi d'Ugarit," in *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud*, I. Paris: Paul Guenther, 1939. Pages 203ff.

_____. "Petite tablette accadienne de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 16 (1934), 194f.

Durham, John W. "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian." Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.

Finet, André. *L'accadien des lettres de Mari*. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1956.

Fisher, Loren R., ed. *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia* 48. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971.

Gamkrelidze, Th.V. "The Akkado-Hittite Syllabary and the Problem of the Origin of the Hittite Script," *ArOr* 29 (1961), 406ff.

Gelb, I.J. "Notes on von Soden's Grammar of Akkadian," *BiOr* 12 (1955), 92ff.

Giacumakis, George, Jr. *The Akkadian of Alalaḫ*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Gordon, Cyrus H. "The Dialect of the Nuzu Tablets," *OrNS* 7 (1938), 32ff., 215ff.

_____. "Observations on the Akkadian Tablets from Ugarit," *RA* 50 (1956), 127ff.

_____. *Ugaritic Textbook, Analecta Orientalia* 38. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965.

Greenfield, Jonas C. "*našû-nadānu* and its Congeners," in Maria de Jong Ellis, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of J.J. Finkelstein*. Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Memoirs* 19 (New Haven, 1977). Pages 87ff.

Gröndahl, Frauke. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967.

Hecker, Karl. *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte, Analecta Orientalia* 44. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1968.

Herdner, Andrée. "Une Particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra," *RÉS* 1938, 76ff.

Joüon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut biblique pontifical, 1923.

Jucquois, Guy. *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest*. Louvain: Institut orientaliste, Bibliothèque de l'université, 1966.

Knudtzon, J.A. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915. Reprinted, Aalen: Otto Zeller, 1964.

Kühne, Cord. "Eine analytische Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 6 (1974), 129ff.

_____. "Nachträge und Berichtigungen zur analytischen Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 7 (1975), 515f.

_____. *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1973.

_____. "Mit Glossenkeilen markierte fremde Wörter in akkadischen Ugarittexten," *UF* 6 (1974), 157ff., *UF* 7 (1975), 253ff.

Labat, René. *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*. Bordeaux: Librarie Delmas, 1932.

_____, and Malbran-Labat, Florence. *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*, 5th ed. Paris: Librarie orientaliste Paul Guenther, 1976.

Liverani, Mario. "Antecedenti del diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit," *RSO* 38 (1963), 131ff.

_____. "Karkemiš nei testi di Ugarit," *RSO* 35 (1960), 135ff.

_____. *Storia di Ugarit*. Roma: Università di Roma, Studi semitici 6, 1962.

_____. "Un tipo di espressione indefinita in accadico e in ugaritico," *RSO* 39 (1964), 199f.

Marcus, R. "On the Genitive after *umma* in the Amarna Tablets," *JCS* 2 (1948), 124f.

Matouš, Lubor. "Les textes accadiens d'Ugarit," *ArOr* 24 (1956), 375ff.

Mayer, Walter. *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1971.

Moran, William L. "The Dual Personal Pronouns in Western
     Peripheral Akkadian," *BASOR* 211 (1973), 50ff.

_____. "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29 (1960), 1ff.

_____. "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as
     Reflected in the Amarna Tablets." Ph. D. dissertation,
     Johns Hopkins University, 1950.

_____. "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Let-
     ters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity*.
     Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1975. Pages 146ff.

Nougayrol, Jean. "Une fable hittite," *Revue hittite et
     asiatique* 67 (1960), 117ff.

_____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, III (MRS VI)*. Paris:
     Imprimerie nationale, 1955.

_____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, IV (MRS IX)*. Paris:
     Imprimerie nationale, 1956.

_____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, VI (MRS XII)*. Paris:
     Imprimerie nationale, 1970.

_____; Laroche, Emmanuel; Virolleaud, Charles; Schaeffer,
     Claude F.A. *Ugaritica V (MRS XVI)*. Paris: Impri-
     merie nationale, 1968.

Oppenheim, A. Leo, et al., eds. *The Assyrian Dictionary of
     the University of Chicago*. Chicago: the Oriental
     Institute, 1956ff.

Parker, S.B. "Studies in the Grammar of the Ugaritic Prose
     Texts." Ph. D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University,
     1967.

Patterson, Richard D. "Old Babylonian Parataxis as Exhibited
     in the Royal Letters of the Middle Old Babylonian
     Period and in the Code of Hammurapi." Ph. D. disser-
     tation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.

Rainey, Anson F. "Enclitic *-ma* and the Logical Predicate
     in Old Babylonian," *IOS* 6 (1976), 51ff.

_____. "Gleanings from Ugarit," *IOS* 3 (1973), 34ff.

_____. "More Gleanings from Ugarit," *IOS* 5 (1975), 18ff.

_____. "Morphology and the Prefix-Tenses of West Semi-
     tized El-^{C}Amarna Tablets," *UF* 7 (1975), 395ff.

_____. "Reflections on the Suffix Conjugations in West Semitized Amarna Tablets," *UF* 5 (1973), 235ff.

Rowton, M.B. "The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian," *JNES* 21 (1962), 233ff.

Salonen, Erkki. *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen.* Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967.

Speiser, E.A. "Akkadian Documents from Ras Shamra," *JAOS* 75 (1955), 154ff.

_____. *Introduction to Hurrian.* New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941.

Swaim, Gerald G. "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets found at Ugarit." Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962.

Thureau-Dangin, F. "Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d'après une tablette de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 15 (1934), 137ff.

_____. "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 18 (1937), 237ff.

Tsevat, Matitiahu. "Marriage and Monarchical Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel," *JSS* 3 (1958), 237ff.

Ungnad, Artur, and Matouš, Lubor. *Grammatik des Akkadischen,* 5th ed. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1969.

Virolleaud, Charles. "Cinq tablettes accadiennes de Ras-Shamra," *RA* 38 (1941), 1ff.

_____. "Six textes de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 28 (1951), 163ff.

von Soden, Wolfram. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965ff.

_____. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik samt Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik, Analecta Orientalia* 33, 47. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1969.

_____, and Röllig, Wolfgang. *Das akkadische Syllabar, Analecta Orientalia* 42. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1976.

Wilhelm, Gernot. *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1970.

Wiseman, D.J. *The Alalakh Tablets*. London: the British
     Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953.

Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed., re-
     vised by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje. Cam-
     bridge: the University Press, 1971.